

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS

**PREPROPOSAL CONFERENCE
RESIDENTIAL RE-ENTRY PROGRAM**

Tuesday, April 18, 2006

9:00 a.m.

Federal Bureau of Prisons
400 First Street, NW
Training Rooms D/E
Washington, D.C. 20534

BUREAU OF PRISON ATTENDEES:

DARLENE ELY, PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE

JAN R. JOHNS, CHIEF NATIONAL ACQUISITIONS SECTION

KRISTY BECK, CONTRACT SPECIALIST, NATIONAL
ACQUISITIONS SECTION

SUSAN VANBAALEN, CHIEF, CHAPLAINCY SERVICES

BRUCE FENNER, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, CHAPLAINCY
SERVICES

DAVID MORTON, FAITH-BASED COORDINATOR, CHAPLAINCY
SERVICES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ATTENDEES:

STEVEN McFARLAND, DIRECTOR TASK FORCE FOR
FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES

JANA HOISINGTON, TASK FORCE FOR FAITH-BASED AND
COMMUNITY INITIATIVES

CONTRACTOR ATTENDEES:

ELAINE MASEBEDER (ph.), CENTER POINT INCORPORATED

JOHN PENDLETON, DISMAS CHARITIES

STEVEN VICE, DISMAS CHARITIES

TRACY MILLER, THE KINTOCK GROUP INCORPORATED

BILL BALFE, ALTAMOUNT PROGRAM INCORPORATED

NORMAN COX, INTERCHANGE FREEDOM INITIATIVE/PRISON FELLOWSHIP

JACK COWLEY, INSTITUTION PROGRAM INCORPORATED

ALVIN WORTHLEY, CHAPLAINCY DEPARTMENT OF THE ASSEMBLIES OF GOD

NATHAN TIMMERMAN, CHAPLAINCY DEPARTMENT OF THE ASSEMBLIES OF GOD

STEVEN GOLDBERG, JEWISH PRISONER SERVICES INTERNATIONAL

JAMES LONG, JEWISH PRISONER SERVICES INTERNATIONAL

NEIL STEINHORN, JEWISH PRISONER SERVICES INTERNATIONAL

BOB MOORE, THE ALEPH INSTITUTE

ALLEN GLUCK, AGUDATH ISRAEL

FRANCES WASHINTON, NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FAITH AND JUSTICE

THEORIOUS HICKMAN, NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FAITH AND JUSTICE

JUANITA JOLLY, NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF FAITH AND JUSTICE

WARREN DOLPHUS, NATIOANL ALLIANCE OF FAITH AND JUSTICE

DAN CARTER, COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND EDUCATION

ALYSSA ADEYEMI, EARTHWALK COMMUNICATIONS

****NOTE: REFER TO PAGES 55 AND 56 FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS.**

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. JOHNS: Good morning. I'd like to welcome you all here and thank you for showing an interest in our residential re-entry program that we are seeking a contractor for or several contractors maybe. I'd like to first introduce our head table here. On my right I have Darlene Ely, she is our Procurement Executive. To my left is Kristy Beck, she is Contract Specialist; David Morton, who is our Faith-Based Coordinator; Bruce Fenner, Assistant Administrator, Chaplaincy Services, and Susan VanBaalen, the Chief of Chaplaincy Services.

We also have with us today Steve McFarland, the Director of the Task Force for Faith Based Initiatives, and also Jana Hoisington, who is also with the Task Force. The way we're going to proceed with this is we will address the technical questions. And if there are any questions that arise that pertain to that question that we're currently on, you can go ahead and ask those questions. And then once we're done with the technical questions, then Kristy will handle the procurement questions. And then we'll have open discussion for any other questions that you might have. I also would like to request that any questions that have not already been submitted to us that you provide them to us in writing after the conference so we can include them with our posting to the Fedbizopps website.

There were two questions that came in that really didn't pertain to technical or procurement. I'll answer those real quick. Somebody had asked how long the conference would last this morning. Just however long it takes us. We do have until 1:00 p.m. in here. So, if necessary, we'll go that long. But hopefully, we'll be able to complete it much sooner than that. And the other question was, will we entertain other questions throughout the conference? And, yes, we will. Okay. And so, David, I will turn it over to you to start addressing the technical questions that you already received.

MR. MORTON: Okay. I have 25 questions that I'll be addressing this morning.

The first question is: How does the Bureau of Prisons define single faith? Is this different than faith-based? The single faith contract teaches the essential components of the overall residential program outlined in the statement of work through the particular principles of faith. A contract issued to a religious organization embodying a particular faith, for example, a Jewish, Christian, Moslem, etcetera. Any questions from that answer?

[No response.]

MR. MORTON: The second question: Will inmates have an incentive, sentence reductions, for example, to volunteer for the residential re-entry program? Are there any perceived barriers in recruitment? There will be no incentives. For example, sentence reductions, t-shirts, special housing areas, the list goes on. None of those will be given to those who participate in and/or complete the residential program. Now, potential contractors must submit a detailed recruitment strategy, including how the program will be advertised in BOP facilities, the criteria for selection, and any requirements, for example, tests, surveys that potential participants must complete before program consideration. The plan should include how the contractor's program will be advertised in a consistent and orderly fashion at all applicable BOP facilities. Details such as the use of video and print media and on site

visits by the contractor staff should be explained. All cost of advertising the program, recruiting inmates, and evaluating applications are the contractor's responsibilities.

Any questions?

MR. VICE: I've got a question.

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. VICE: Regarding recruiting, what's the--

MS. JOHNS: I'm sorry. I forgot to say if you would step to the podium that way our court reporter can hear.

MR. VICE: Steve Vice with Dismas Charities. The question is: In terms of recruiting, is there a limit on the recruiting area? You talk about low and medium security institutions. So if you have the program provided at a specific institution, is there a limit on the other institutions that you would go out and recruit from or is that just up to the vendor or am I misinterpreting that?

MR. MORTON: It's really up to the vendor to make that proposal. And, of course, that will be placed in the proposal as far as the cost and those types of things too, you know, associated costs with recruiting.

MR. VICE: Okay.

MR. MORTON: And so really it is up to the vendor on what area or where they will do their recruiting.

MR. VICE: Okay. Good thanks.

MR. MORTON: I'm sorry?

MS. VANBAALEN: The inmates would be transferred.

MR. MORTON: That's correct. The inmates would be transferred if they were approved--

MS. VANBAALEN: To the site.

MR. MORTON: To the site if they were approved for the program.

MR. VICE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. COWLEY: At your expense?

MR. MORTON: At our expense.

MR. COWLEY: What might we expect as a cooperative effort from the Bureau in terms of recruitment inside the facilities or is this seen as the total responsibility of the contractor?

MR. MORTON: I would anticipate that whenever contractors are creating their proposals for the recruitment and after that recruitment plan has been approved by the BOP and contracting, whenever we go through the whole process, there will be a means whereby the contractor will be able to coordinate with the institutions where they will want to do the recruiting and there will be some guidelines set up to follow so that the recruitment might take place. So there will be a lot of communication about it.

MR. COWLEY: I guess, does the BOP see this as a partnership in terms of they, they want to see the units full?

MR. MORTON: We do want to see the units full.

MS. VANBAALEN: But we won't be doing the recruiting.

MR. MORTON: Right. Mr. Cowley, we will not be doing the recruiting for the contractor. But we do see this as a partnership. We would like to see the units full.

MR. GLUCK: I am Allen Gluck. I could see a circumstance where an individual who is in a camp currently--I can see a circumstance where an individual who is currently in a camp might want to transfer to a facility like this. Would there be a barrier for him to do that? Could we recruit that kind of individual?

MR. MORTON: You would be able to recruit anyone for the program. And if they request voluntarily to go to that program, we would consider them to be a part of the program.

MR. GLUCK: Thank you.

MR. COWLEY: I was thinking of my question and I didn't listen to the answer a while ago. The BOP, they will pay the cost for transportation from institution to the other in terms of moving the inmate, right?

MR. MORTON: That's correct.

Question number three: Does office space, as referred to on page 7 of the RFP, include space for group rooms? Office space and group program areas are provided for contractors to deliver their proposed program according to the statement of work.

Question number four: Can further clarification be provided regarding the 24 to life criteria for female inmate placement in the program? How will they discharge if it is a life sentence or what is the maximum stay in the program? Life sentence inmates, female inmates who and complete the 18 month residential program will not be discharged from an institution to the community. Inmates will have a mentoring relationship with volunteers while in the residential phase of the program as outlined in the SOW. Mentoring relationships for life term inmates will be maintained after completion as

these types of relationships lend to continued positive institution adjustment. Mentors, as outlined in the SOW, will be connected to inmates for at least six months following the residential phase. Contractors will establish mentor relationships for life term inmates for a period of six months as a follow-up to the completion of the residential program.

Any questions?

Mr. Cowley?

MR. COWLEY: Thank you. Upon completion of the program will the inmates remain at that institution? Will they, number one, stay in program if they're not going to discharge, stay in program meaning will they stay in the unit? Or will they at least stay in the facility in which they're assigned at that point?

MR. MORTON: Are we talking about female inmates?

MR. COWLEY: We're talking about all inmates.

MR. MORTON: All inmates. Depending on how much time is left, like an inmate may have a year, or so, more that's remaining on the sentence. We would probably transfer that inmate away from that unit if that inmate had more time left on the sentence. And it would probably be that the person would go closer to their release destination. And that would afford them family visits, and those types of things, after they've completed the program. If they're within less than a year, perhaps, I don't have a particular date in mind, but if they're close to being released from that institution or from an institution, there's a great possibility that they would stay in that institution and continue that relationship maybe outside of the unit, outside of a residential unit and stay at that unit until they have completed their sentence.

MS. VANBAALEN: It would seem that some of that would depend on the space in the unit. That is, if the unit is full and the person has less than a year on their sentence, they would, no doubt, have to leave the unit because the space, the bed space is needed. But would remain at the institution if they have less than a year remaining on their sentence.

MR. COX: I'm Norman Cox, Interchange Freedom Initiative and Prison Fellowship. You mentioned a move to an institution close to their release destination. Do you have any statistics on BOP releases over all to give us some idea of where the majority of your releasees go, what their destination may be geographically, cities, or anything like that?

MS. VANBAALEN: I think we'll have to get that--

MR. MORTON: We'd have to do some research on that particular question.

MS. VANBAALEN: It is urban, though. We do know that the majority are released to major urban centers.

MR. COWLEY: Is it against BOP policy for an inmate to make the decision on release based upon his changing his mind? At what point does the inmate say

this is where I'm going? In other words, if they come into the program and it's at Seagoville, can they decide then to stay in the Dallas area, even though they may be from California? Can they change their point of re-entry?

MR. MORTON: They do have that ability, and it's done through the unit team and it's approved up through the chain of command.

MR. COWLEY: How difficult is it to do, do you know?

MR. MORTON: They would actually write a request to their unit team requesting a change of release destination. But it would be a function of the unit team to start that process for them.

MS. VANBAALEN: One of the factors in that is that, one of the determinants in that in any change of release destination is the willingness of the--release destination other than where they were, the willingness of the release destination to accept them in probation. So that, and that's where probably a major stickler would be for that issue is that you can imagine that most, most jurisdictions aren't anxious to have somebody else's problems, as well as their own, released to them as they would view that.

MR. MORTON: Any other questions?

[No response.]

MR. MORTON: Does the BOP currently work with faith-based organizations in these areas? If so, can the BOP provide a listing of them? The BOP currently works with many organizations through contractual relationships. The BOP will not provide a list of organizations.

The next question: On page 6 of the RFP, under the section measuring results, can further clarification be provided as to what the baseline measures are?

The Bureau will separately--let me see. Hold on. Pardon me for a second. Okay. The Bureau will separately contract for data research assessment of all programs measuring rates of recidivism and rearrests for one to four years after release, employment, housing, mentor matching, and other identified areas. All contractors will fully cooperate with the evaluation contractor to ensure the adequate collection of all data and participant follow up information, as well as aspects of program design necessary for successful evaluation.

Any questions?

[No response.]

MR. MORTON: Question number 7: Are mentors considered volunteers as noted in the RFP? Are they considered volunteers and is the 90-day clearance negotiable or can it be shortened? Yes. We, we will consider volunteers or mentors as volunteers. The 90-day clearance is the average time for clearance of volunteers. And once a volunteer is cleared for service, the volunteer will be able to provide the assigned service.

MR. GLUCK: Are we permitted to include paid mentors in our program?

MR. MORTON: We're going to answer that question very shortly.

Question number 8: On page 11 in the last paragraph, what is considered an acceptable turnover rate? Should the contracted staff turnover rate exceed an acceptable level, as determined by the contracting officer or repetitive NCIC/NLETS or fingerprint checks are necessary due to contractor error, the actual cost of processing these security checks, like NCIS/NLETS and name and fingerprint check must be withheld from the amounts due to the contractor. Actually, it will be the site COTR instead of the contracting officer, the site COTR will determine that.

Question number 9: On page 15, can information be provided for each pilot site regarding how many institutional emergencies have occurred in the past two years? In the past two years one disturbance was reported at one of the institutions.

Question number 10: If a community program is not a faith-based organization, how should we address the completion of attachment for credential of religious services contractor? Community organizations are not expected to complete the credential of religious service contractor form. This form serves as a credentialing tool for religious service contractors. Community organizations who might subcontract religious service contractors are required to have the religious contractor form completed.

Question number 11: Is there a standard length of stay for the program or is it more fluid and dependent upon individual performance? The statement of work outlines that the program is an 18 month program. It's a residential program. And inmates who apply for and participate in the program are expected to stay in the program for the 18 month duration.

Question number 12: In attachment--is that II or 2--

MS. BECK: It would be 2.

MR. MORTON: In attachment 2 it states: All plans, policies, and procedures shall be developed by the contractor and submitted with the contractor proposal. All is a big word. Does BOP desire a comprehensive outline of plans, policies, and procedures or is it really intended for the proposer to have completed this task in three weeks? The BOP desires a comprehensive outline of plans, policies, and procedures submitted with the contractor's proposal within the time constraints outlined in the SOW.

Number 13: Is this a similar program operated by the--or is this or a similar program operated by the BOP taking place within the BOP system right now? The Bureau of Prisons currently has an 18 month multi-faith re-entry program called Life Connections. This is a residential program and it's currently offered in five different locations around the country.

MR. MOORE: Excuse me. I have a question. Good morning, Bob Moore from the Aleph Institute. It seems to me that it would be very helpful as a proposed contractor to perhaps visit one of these Life Connections programs and see how it operates, maybe even talk to some of their personnel. Would the BOP facilitate a visit of that nature to one of your facilities?

MR. MORTON: We would certainly look at your request and try to work with you as well as we can to let you visit one of our sites if that request is made.

MR. MOORE: All right.

MR. MORTON: Question number 14: Is this program similar to the unit classification team system in the Bureau? Now, inmates are assigned to unit teams and in these unit teams there are many things that are discussed. And one of the things that is discussed in the unit team process is release preparation programming. Other things are notifications to the inmate, halfway house placement, sentence computations, programming, education, work issues, the unit team talks to them about sanitation. And they also talk to them about conduct, how the inmate conducts themselves in the context of the institution. They talk to them about living skills and also do some counseling with the inmate while they are in that unit team process.

Question number 15: Will the program participants be referred to a community corrections program upon release from this program? The unit team will refer inmates at the time they are eligible for the community corrections programs. And some inmates will not be eligible for CCP upon their release because of the length of time remaining on their sentences.

Question 16: Will the program participants earn good time in this program? And the answer is, yes, inmates will receive good time in this residential faith-based program. However, shortened sentences will not be given to inmates who participate in the residential program, faith-based program. Now, when we talk about good time, good conduct time, prior to November 1987, inmates are given 54 days--if they're sentenced prior to November 1987, 54 days are given in good time per year. Now, prior to 1987, they're eligible for parole. And in that time they're given three days per month for good time. And this is aside from any program participation. The program participation, in this case, doesn't affect that good time rating.

Question number 17: The program will be open to inmates who are not U.S. Citizens so long as final order of deportation has not been entered against a non U.S. Citizen inmate. Therefore, if a non U.S. Citizen inmate seeks entry into the program, will he be admissible even though, for example, there is an INS detainer lodged against him? If an inmate is a non U.S. Citizen and we anticipate that they may not be released to the community, the inmate may not be approved for the re-entry program if they have an INS deportation program placed upon them. Each case is looked at individually. The INS may say that the inmate may not be deported, and there will be a note in some of the unit classification communication there that will indicate that the inmate is not going to be deported. These inmates will definitely be eligible for the residential program. If the inmate does have a deportation order or if there is an INS detainer placed on the inmate to be deported, they will not be eligible for the residential program.

MR. MOORE: Excuse me. I recognize that question. I think I submitted it. But there's a big difference between a final order of deportation and a detainer. Very often a person's deportability isn't determined until after he completes his sentence and is handed over to immigration. So I view a circumstance where there is a detainer, for example, on the one hand and a

final order of deportation on the other, as being dramatically different circumstances. And, yet, what I heard you say is that you treat a detainer pretty much the same as a final order of deportation. Did I hear that right?

MR. MORTON: If an inmate has an INS detainer, we anticipate that they're not going to return to the community.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Thanks.

MR. MORTON: Question number 18: Will a United States Citizen inmate who has a detainer lodged against him from other jurisdictions be allowed to enroll in the program even though that inmate, for example, has a consecutive sentence to serve in a state jurisdiction and so will not, therefore, be released after completion of his federal sentence? Each inmate request for re-entry program will be evaluated individually. That needs to be stated. That's very important, to ensure that they meet the established program selection criteria. But if an inmate has a consecutive sentence in a state he or she will not be eligible for the program. Any questions?

[No response.]

MR. MORTON: Number 19: Has any firm decision been made as to where the Jewish faith-based residential re-entry program will be situated? No decisions have been made regarding where any faith-based residential re-entry program will be provided.

Question number 20: The program is a seven day a week--is seven days a week from at least 8:00 o'clock a.m. to 9:00 p.m. The Jewish Sabbath is Biblically mandated to be a work restriction day. And does the BOP expect that Jewish staff will work on the Sabbath? The contractor must provide sufficient staffing to cover a religious schedule, including day time and evening programming during the week and on weekends for up to 150 inmates per pilot site. It's desirable, of course, that we have staff contractors there during that time. We would really encourage that. Now, contractors should submit, with their draft proposals, a draft schedule of programs and activities and staffing plans. The contractor should demonstrate a program and staffing schedule which covers at least 40 program hours per week. And all inmate participants will work half days on an institution work detail assigned by appropriate institutional staff. Now, in the case of a Friday evening/Saturday work restriction type of situation, you know, secular program could be provided by non Jews for those program hours. So, you know, we would ask that the folks who are putting together the proposal think about how those other hours would be accommodated in the proposal.

MR. COWLEY: I'm sorry. There was a policy passed not long ago that, in the BOP that there would be direct observance of any inmate group, as I understand it, and if we have 150 in program and they are in the evening divided up into small groups for programming, does the policy that will be provided the vendor meet indicate that there will be direct observation of each small group?

MR. MORTON: Are these inmate led groups?

MR. COWLEY: They could be inmate led groups.

MS. VANBAALEN: Our policy is that inmate led groups do require monitoring. However, if there is a badged contractor or volunteer with the group, they require only intermittent supervision, not constant.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): ~~Sander Goldberg~~ (Steven Goldberg) representing Jewish Prison Services International. I think that the previous question subsumes something of what I wanted to ask concerning this question that you're dealing with right now. And that is on the question of Friday night and Saturdays, the problem is that Orthodox Jews who would be mentors or teachers in the program, it will be very, very difficult for them. They can't ride and probably there's no where to stay over near the facility within walking distance. And they don't like to be away from their families so much. So the question is like this, that quite often, especially among Orthodox Jews who are in prison, a lot of them have a lot of scholarly training themselves. So would they be allowed to conduct the programs in the place of the regular rabbis or teacher during the week on Saturdays and holidays when it would be difficult to get the regular staff or rotations of the regular staff to come?

MR. MORTON: I would not have any objection to their leading classes, leading groups.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): So that would work.

MR. MORTON: Not inmates?

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): No. I'm talking about inmates.

MR. MORTON: Not inmates. I thought you were saying outside people, not the rabbis, but maybe an outside person.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Oh, inmates--

MR. MORTON: Inmates would not. Except, except of there was supervision there while they were leading the groups, staff supervision.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Okay. So would that be, could that be arranged? You know, just for the Saturdays and the holidays that there will be staff supervision so that a rabbi who happens to be an inmate or a scholar, a Jewish scholar could take over, conduct those classes on Saturdays or they would have perhaps an alternative class in a different subject which he would do every Saturday as, you know, as a weekly class like that?

MS. VANBAALEN: I think what Chaplain Morton already said is that there is the possibility of having a secular piece of the program, I'll just use as an example, maybe family life, that might be a part of the program or a whole series of secular presentations that would be done during that time by-- through the contractor but that would not necessarily involve the involvement of an Orthodox Jew. The other possibility to even take a look at is, in fact, the inmates who participate will all be Orthodox Jews necessarily. And it might be an appropriate time, for example, to have a reformed, a reform rabbi. I know that this is a conflictual--that you would view that differently than I. But that there are groups within Judaism that do travel for work or that do travel. Now, I understand the conflict there. But that's why I go back to the secular, that there could be secular presentations during that time.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Yeah. That makes sense.

MS. VANBAALEN: But the inmates could not lead the groups.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Even on a temporary basis like that?

MS. VANBAALEN: Well, that would be 52 and 26--that would be 78 times. That's kind of a lot.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Mm-hum. Okay.

[Discussion off the record.]

MR. MORTON: Question number 21: If Jewish staff were expected to work on the Sabbath, will there be within walking distance of the place where the Jewish program will be offered, a place to live or stay for Friday night or on other Jewish holidays that involve work prescription? There will be no accommodations for housing that will be provided the contract workers who supervise and administer residential re-entry programs. The cost of the lodging could be built into the bid, however. That would need to be included perhaps.

Question number 22: If the Jewish program is offered at a low and an inmate is classified as a medium, am I correct in concluding that he will not be eligible unless and until the inmate is classified as a low? And likewise, if the program is offered at a medium security facility, will persons classified as low or minimum or even community custody be permitted to attend the program in the higher security institution? Must be said that inmates must be willing to have the Life Connections program site designated for them. And, of course, we'll evaluate each case individually so that these--they can attend the program that they are requesting. Management variables can be given so that inmates can attend or will be permitted to attend these types of programs.

Number 23: How will separate issues be resolved for attendance in this program? Obviously, if two persons cannot be housed together, then there must be some rule as to which will be excluded. What is that rule? Inmates with separate issues, these instances will be resolved by the BOP designator, the person who actually designates the inmate to the Life Connection site. There may be instances where an inmate cannot attend the residential program because of the separate issues that they've encountered over the course of their incarceration period.

Question number 24: The Jewish Faith-Based Residential Re-entry Program is open to all persons of all faiths. For admission purposes, how does the BOP propose to resolve a situation where, say, for example, there is only one available slot and the two persons applying for that slot are a Jew and a non-Jew. Would there be any admissions preference for the person of the Jewish faith? Once again, inmates must be willing to have the Life Connections program site designated for them. And each case will be evaluated individually. Persons of the same faith will ordinarily be given preference over inmates of another faith, ordinarily.

Question number 25: And I think this is my last question. Recognizing that attendees of the Jewish Faith-Based Residential Re-entry Program may belong to any religion, the program guidelines clearly mandate that they must be allowed to attend their own religious services from the religion to which they are affiliated. Some of the program activities of a Jewish faith-based program may involve religious services such as regular morning, afternoon, and evening prayers. On the Sabbath there would be a Sabbath service. Would members of other faiths be excused from these services? Would they be required to attend but not participate?

Inmates accepted into the faith-based programs who are not adherent to that program's faith must be excused from program activities to attend worship services of their own faith traditions, but must otherwise participate in all non religious aspects of the faith-based program. Inmates may not be required to participate in religious ritual practices or creedal confessions inconsistent with their own faith or practice. But they may not be excluded from attending or participating.

Any questions?

[No response.]

MS. BECK: Okay. My turn. I wanted to mention something that was about--I believe that someone had mentioned the possibility of going out to a Life Connections program institution site. And that's something we'd have to discuss. And if that opportunity is made available, it would be offered to any interested parties who would want to attend.

Any questions on that?

Go ahead.

MR. PENDLETON: The Life Connections program that the Bureau has piloted in five or six different areas across the country, would this solicitation be the same or would it mirror this program that's currently going on?

MS. BECK: It's building off the first program; correct.

MR. MORTON: There are some similarities in the program.

MR. PENDLETON: Okay. But it's not the exact same program that we're talking about; right?

MR. MORTON: Right.

MR. PENDLETON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BECK: Okay. Any others? Go ahead.

MS. WASHINGTON: Good morning. I'm Frances Washington with the National Alliance of Faith in Justice. Just one point of clarification to make sure that I understood something correctly that inmates who are serving a life sentence are eligible for the program, but inmates who have consecutive sentences are not eligible. Is that what I heard?

MR. MORTON: Inmates, female inmates who have life sentences are eligible for the Life Connections 2 program. Inmates who have detainers where a state has placed a detainer on them for a crime that was committed in the state, let's say a crime was committed in Georgia and the state of Georgia places a detainer on the inmate for the crime that they committed there in the State of Georgia, and that crime, the sentence is to run consecutively behind the federal sentence that they are already serving. Now, you know, sometimes there are inmates who have detainers and these detainers run concurrently with the federal sentence. We have to ascertain at that point, does the state, will the state pick them up at the end of their federal sentence and make them serve more time or will they dispose of that time during that concurrent sentence. We have to ascertain that.

MS. WASHINGTON: Okay. So it's a--this pertains more to detainers from other states. So you're serving a consecutive sentence--

MR. MORTON: Right.

MS. WASHINGTON: --on an offense from a different state?

MR. MORTON: That's correct.

MS. WASHINGTON: Okay. So if it's a consecutive sentence from the same state, then you're eligible?

MR. MORTON: No. I'm--federal sentences and state sentences, they're not the same.

MS. WASHINGTON: Okay.

MR. MORTON: You know, the state, an inmate may have caused some time for doing a crime in a state and, you know, then there's a sentencing hearing and there's a detainer placed on them. Whenever they complete their federal sentence, if it's running consecutive, the state will pick them up from the prison system and place them in their prison system to complete the time.

MS. WASHINGTON: Okay. All right.

MS. VANBAALEN: Could I speak to the women issue? The reason for the length of time on sentence being extended for the women is because we have a small percentage of women inmates. And in order to make the program available, to maximize the opportunity for women, if we were to stay within that 24 to 60 months, there wouldn't be a sufficient number of women who would volunteer--we believe that there wouldn't be a sufficient number of women who would volunteer for the program to keep the program running. And so the decision was made to allow women, because it's such a small part of the population, to have extended sentencing time. But people with shorter sentences would receive preference. I mean, those who will release to the community would be released, would have preference in placement in the program.

MS. BECK: Any other questions?

[No response.]

MS. BECK: I'm going to go ahead and go through the procurement questions and answers that we received in response to the RFP. If you have any questions, same thing as David did, if you have any questions with each question, just raise your hand, stand up, and go ahead and ask. Okay.

First question is: Will the BOP provide a listing of other contractors attending the conference for potential collaboration? Yes, the BOP shall post the list of attendees along with the minutes of the pre-proposal conference through the website that you found the solicitation from, which is www.Fedbizopps.gov. I'm sure that you guys should have that web address. It shall be the responsibility of the contractor to organize partnering or teaming arrangements.

Go ahead.

MR. VICE: By when?

MS. BECK: Hum?

MR. VICE: By when will you post that--will we get the answers on this?

MS. BECK: Oh. It should be probably within eight days, eight working days we get the transcript back.

MR. VICE: Thanks. Okay.

MS. BECK: Question number 2: In the solicitation provisions Section A.15, FAR 52.212-2, which is the evaluation criteria, Section C states, a written notice of award for acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise, which is on page 18 of the RFP, does this mean that the submission of a proposal constitutes a legally binding contract should the BOP choose to summarily send an award letter or is this merely a proposal for subsequent with selected vendor? The contractor's proposal represents an offer to the BOP. It's at the discretion of the contracting officer whether or not to award with or without discussions. If award is made with or without discussion, the BOP shall require the awardee to confirm acceptance by signing the contract document or beginning performance of services. Also, a legally binding contract with the BOP consists of the awardee's proposal along with the BOP statement of work, required clauses, and any other required documents.

Questions?

[No response.]

MS. BECK: Question number 3: Are teaching tools, such as video recorders, cameras, etcetera, provided or available? No. It's going to be the responsibility of the contractor to provide such tools if it's deemed necessary.

Questions?

[No response.]

MS. BECK: Question number 4: Is the urinalysis requirement for staff for pre-employment only? Urinalysis testing is required on a yearly basis for all contractors working with BOP facilities.

Question 5: Does the BOP use a particular urine vendor for their staff testing? If so, is it possible for the contractor to use the same? Is there estimation on cost per test? For urinalysis testing the contracting officer's technical representative at the respective institution shall set up a time with the BOP's health services department for the contractor's employees to come in for testing. The contractor bears no cost for this service.

MR. MOORE: Say, for example, the contractor is an organization in Florida with 25 employees. And they bid and, and operate a program in South Carolina staffed by people who move and live in South Carolina. I take it that what you're saying is the people who would be subject to urinalysis testing would be the people in South Carolina who are running the program and not all 25 members of an organization that is out of state; am I correct?

MS. JOHNS: Correct.

MS. BECK: Yes.

MS. JOHNS: People that are actually in the institution running the program will be the ones to be tested.

MS. BECK: Okay. Any other questions?

Question number 6: Does the contract include setting up residential spaces for participants in the program aside from the mainstream population? The respective BOP institution shall provide a housing unit, however, it shall be set aside for inmates that are enrolled and participating in the residential re-entry program.

Go ahead.

MR. COWLEY: I don't think I understood that.

MS. BECK: Okay. The question was asking if there was going to be separate residential housing units set up for the inmates who are going to be participating in the program. And, yes, we'll have a housing unit for them.

MR. COWLEY: I do have a follow-up to that.

MS. BECK: Okay.

MR. COWLEY: The program is 150 beds, let's say, and at that time--as we gear up or as we become full and people leave, will the BOP place non participating inmates in those beds or will they hold them for a period of time until which participating inmates will be placed in those beds?

MS. VANBAALEN: Let me just--the likelihood, if there are inmates on the wait list to get into the program or inmates who have completed the program and remaining at the institution, it's likely that they would remain in those beds. However, bed space is at a premium. And if there were not inmates

involved in the program or committed to the program and they needed the bed space, it's likely that that bed space would have to be used by non participants. However, the priority would go as it has in our own program, to those who are wait listed or those who have completed the program and are remaining at the institution.

MR. COWLEY: This, when we talk about, when you said our own program, the BOP still sees this Life Connections 2 as their program.

MS. VANBAALEN: Well, all--I don't know how to answer that. It's a contracted, fully contracted program.

MR. COWLEY: But it's certainly a partnership.

MS. VANBAALEN: Yes.

MR. COWLEY: It's certainly the BOP program.

MS. VANBAALEN: I'm just speaking from experience that we already have. And there have been times when those beds were needed, even though our, our commitment is to keep those beds for people participating in the program or on either end of the program, waiting to get in or waiting to get out. I mean, waiting for--

MR. COWLEY: And this is the last question I have concerning that. Knowing how prisons operate to a certain degree in terms of getting support for programs from not only wardens, chiefs of programming, and at the BOP department head level appeared, if we see that there is currently in Life Connections, if there are going to be 15 vacancies at Leavenworth, I'm assuming--I know that the word goes out, we've got, we're going to have some vacancies. We need to get these beds filled. Make sure the inmates are aware, all those sorts of things. Do you anticipate that happening with Life Connections 2 in terms of we've got 15 beds, and it's at a medium security institution, and the memo goes out that we've got 15 beds, do you think that the institutional classification directors, wardens, deputy wardens, whoever will say we need to get those beds filled?

MS. VANBAALEN: Can I? I mean, I--

MR. MORTON: Sure.

MS. VANBAALEN: I definitely do. The thing is, though, that these are both the Life Connections program and the contracting, the contracted programs, they're voluntary. And so we can't, we can't send anybody to those beds.

MR. COWLEY: But you can, you can get the word out and get people to volunteer.

MS. VANBAALEN: It will, it will depend on the contractors letting us know, letting the institutions know.

MR. COWLEY: Sure.

MS. VANBAALEN: For example, just to use a general example, a flier posted for when the next cohort would begin or when the next, you know, application--having those things, sending those things to the institutions, they would definitely be posted, and so on. So that the program could--we want it to be filled. We want it to succeed, absolutely.

MR. MORTON: We're committed to the program.

MS. JOHNS: Could I ask a question right here that may help answer that? Once you start the recruitment process, that's not going to stop; correct, because you have to continue to plan for the next 18 month cohort that's going to start.

MS. VANBAALEN: Right.

MS. JOHNS: So, I mean, you should, we hope or anticipate that we will always have, we will always be recruiting and you'll just have a waiting type of inmates for the next program.

MR. COWLEY: I think my concern is, and I'm not, I'm not suspect here, but knowing, knowing the significance of the recruitment and understanding that the contractor will probably feel more obliged to keep those beds filled than perhaps the BOP who has a lot of other things going on as well, and, yet, there isn't any--you can't use any of the funds for recruiting. Can you explain--

MS. VANBAALEN: I don't know what you mean.

MR. COWLEY: It was very clear that, that travel, that videos, that no money, as I read it, could be expended for recruiting.

MS. BECK: It's your responsibility, but it definitely can be incorporated into your pricing schedule.

MR. COWLEY: Oh, okay.

MS. BECK: To your proposal. But it's just your responsibility.

MR. COWLEY: Okay. So it can be, there as a line item that can be for recruiting purposes?

MR. MORTON: Absolutely.

MR. COWLEY: Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. JOHNS: Well, not a separate line item.

MR. MORTON: That will be part of your proposal.

MR. COWLEY: Well, I mean, but it--

MS. JOHNS: It should be considered in your monthly operating expenses.

MR. COWLEY: As far as the operations.

MR. MORTON: Absolutely.

MR. COX: Would it be possible to get some information on the size of the units, living units in each facility, i.e., the program is for 150. Does that consist of three 50 bed units, a series of 75 bed units, what exactly would we be looking at, at each location? And secondly, are there female units in any other of the six locations except Hazelton?

MS. BECK: No. Just Hazelton. And we'd have to, the first questions, we'd have to do a little research on to get an answer.

MR. MOORE: Can I ask a question that kind of dovetails a little bit? Earlier it was mentioned by Reverend Morton that office space and meeting rooms would be made available. This kind of dovetails with the inquiry I have now about the dorms. Is it anticipated that most of the inmate meeting activity and educational programming will occur in the dorm area or in, say, for example, the chapel or the educational facilities which may not be usually open in the evenings or could be made available? Where would they, where would these meetings occur? Where would the group meetings occur, the teaching opportunities, where would they occur?

MR. MORTON: We anticipate that some of the programming will go on in the units or in the housing units, depending on how much space is available in those units to provide those programs. We also anticipate some of these activities going on in the chapel. And once again, we'll need to research these locations just to get a better feel of your question and the preceding question.

MR. MOORE: Thank you.

MR. GLUCK: I recognize you need to research each of these facilities. My question is, though, is it your intention to create a sort of encapsulated unit whereby these 150 inmates sort of live, work, and do everything? Obviously there are other, you know, it's a big facility. And, you know, there's only one gym, and whatever it may be. But is that the intention that you're trying--is that what you're trying to do here?

MR. MORTON: We're trying to set up a residential program where they will live, work and communicate and study and pray and do all the things that are essential to the department itself.

MS. BECK: Any other questions?

[No response.]

MS. BECK: Okay. I'll go ahead and continue.

Number 7, question number 7: Can a minimum payment be established regardless of referrals, e.g., break even floor level? A minimum payment shall not be established, however, the contractor shall provide a monthly operating price with their pricing schedule. For payment purposes, the monthly operating price shall not begin accruing until active participation by inmates in the program. Enrollment alone shall not be considered participation for the

purposes of pricing and billing. The monthly operating price will be priced according to the three levels of inmate participation in the program which are 1 to 75 inmates per month; 76 to 135 inmates per month; and 135 to 150 inmates per month.

Questions?

MR. GLUCK: We all hope this question is irrelevant. But what happens if we sign a contract and we're all set up and no one volunteers from a procurement point of view, contractual obligation point of view? What happens to the financial liabilities of the BOP and the contractor? Because we are totally dependent on the inmates.

MS. BECK: Yes. That's correct.

MS. JOHNS: Well, that would be, if that would occur, we would have to go back and revisit whether there is a requirement for this program at all.

MR. GLUCK: But the contractor needs to talk about this possibility because otherwise all of us have a huge liability if we can't get out of what we've been talking about.

MS. JOHNS: Right. But that, I mean, if that--we'd have to sit down at that time to see what we'd have to think about. We just cannot see that that's going to happen, though, with the number of inmates that we have.

MR. GLUCK: How can we sign a contract based on the fact that you don't really think it's going to happen?

MS. JOHNS: I understand that. I mean, we--we have participation in our current program going on. So this is just more opportunity for our inmates.

MR. WORTHLEY: What is your waiting list now for inmates to get involved in Life Connections 1 and how, how steady does that stay?

MR. MORTON: Each institution, which offer the Life Connections Program I, are required to do monthly orientations, they have a five minute video that introduces the Life Connections program to the inmates. And each month on the religious services schedule, we have Life Connections three part orientation where the program, as a whole, is discussed with the inmates. And then they're given the opportunity voluntarily to sign up to request participation in the program. We've had some good numbers. I, I guess I can give him the number of people who are on our waiting list today. There are 204 inmates on our waiting list right now that are waiting to go into the program. So our numbers, as the program has matured, our numbers are becoming more steady. The program is maturing. Inmates realize what the program is about. And, and, you know, whenever they come out of our program, they've completed, they go back to some of the units and they say, hey, you should be a part of this program. And by word of mouth, this recruiting is going on among the inmates. So recruiting is good.

MR. COWLEY: If we had a flow chart, the way I understand it, we have three months to gear up.

MS. BECK: Ramp up.

MR. COWLEY: And will there be a decision made that this program will be only 75 or will we have to anticipate that all of them will max out at 150 so that we obviously will have time to hire staff if we know we're going to need to be getting some more inmates, then we have--but you can't have a full contingency of staff waiting on the inmates to get there. So can you flow chart that as to how you anticipate the procurement and the in flow of inmates to sort of coincide how that would take place?

MS. BECK: I'm trying to understand. So--

MR. COWLEY: So we bid, we don't bid--we bid a hundred--let's say we're assuming that each program will be 150.

MS. BECK: We fully anticipate 150 within the program.

MR. COWLEY: So our budget would have to, at some point, represent 150. But we would not be required to hire up to 150 if we only had 75.

MS. BECK: Are you--

MS. JOHNS: Could I--your proposal should be based on the maximum having a full contingency.

MR. COWLEY: Correct.

MS. JOHNS: That's why we have these other two breakdowns in pricing schedule for a monthly operating cost if when the first program--when it first starts up we have 75 when the program begins, that's what your monthly operating would cost. So, you know, pulling out of the blue here, say, to run a full contingent for 150, you'd say you'd have to have 12 staff all the time. But if you just had a contingent of 75, you may only need 7 staff. So that's why we had those breakdowns of operating, the monthly operating costs.

MR. COWLEY: Yes. And that's--but how long will we be given to do that ramp up?

MS. VANBAALEN: Could I--

MS. JOHNS: Sure.

MS. VANBAALEN: This is how I might envision. I might envision that you would start out with approximately a third of the total and get that group up and running. And then have a second group, perhaps three months later, or something like that, that would be a second contingent of about a third of the group, and then a third. So within the year you would be up to the total 150. I think when you realistically think about the number of moves, and so on, that could be involved in this that it isn't realistic to expect that on September 1, 150 would necessarily be there.

MR. COWLEY: Nor would we have to have a staff for 150.

MR. MORTON: That's correct.

MS. VANBAALEN: But you might even build that in as you're working on your contract that you'd start with X number and then add X or whatever.

MR. COWLEY: So can you say that if we start with, let's say we start with 75 and we hire up 75 during that three month period of time we ramp up and we're going to start with 75. Once we see we're going to go to the next third, how long will it take for that--will the money be there and all we have to do is bill it or will the money have to then somehow be appropriated and other contractual things happen which will enable us to hire up or is the money there and all we have to do is hire up and then submit you a monthly invoice?

MS. JOHNS: When we award the contract for the base year, it will be for the estimated cost for that year.

MR. COWLEY: Okay. All right.

MS. JOHNS: Even though you bill us monthly.

MR. COWLEY: There's still money in the bank, so to speak?

MS. VANBAALEN: We will have the funding for that one. Just like the government always does, we have to wait for our next appropriations for each performance period. But for that base year, the funds will be there.

MR. COWLEY: Is there an estimate that this program will cost when you're--is it appropriate to even ask how much has been budgeted per program?

MS. JOHNS: It will depend on what the contracts are awarded for.

MR. COWLEY: Okay. So but are you estimating that it will be somewhere in the neighborhood of Life Connections 1?

MS. BECK: Just depends on what the contractor comes back with their proposal.

MS. JOHNS: Right. We don't know what those contract awards are. Those are done by the individual institutions. So then their program is not--

MR. COWLEY: Well, are we going to say, are we going to--is Life Connections 1 and Life Connections 2, in terms of research and as far as the BOP and evaluating the effectiveness of the program, are we talking apples and apples so the Life Connections 1 program will have, to some degree, the same staffing ratios and resources available as Life Connections 2 when it comes to outcomes?

MS. ELY: I think all bidders and proposers need to look at the statement of work that we're providing and provide your proposal based the statement of work. And not get tied into looking at what our existing program is because it's two separate programs.

MR. COWLEY: Okay. So it won't--

MS. ELY: We have two separate statement of works.

MR. COWLEY: So it won't be evaluated against one another?

MS. ELY: You need to base your proposal on that.

MR. COWLEY: We're not running a race here?

MS. JOHNS: It's not apples and apples if you're looking at it that way, no.

MS. BECK: I will continue.

Number 8: If a transfer to the program is delayed due to BOP transportation issues, institutional emergency, or other BOP reason, will the contractor receive payment regardless? The contractor will receive a monthly payment, in accordance with the pricing schedule, regardless of BOP delays.

Can mentors be paid a stipend? This shall be at the discretion of the contractor, but should be taken into consideration when proposing the pricing schedule. The answer to your question earlier.

Can mentors be paid or can mentors be reimbursed for mileage? This shall be at the discretion of the contractor, at no cost to the BOP.

Can the contractor fund events for mentors, e.g., monthly dinners? This shall also be at the discretion of the contractor and at no cost to the BOP.

MR. MOORE: When you say no cost, you mean no line item for it and it shouldn't appear in your budget?

MS. BECK: Yes. Correct.

Okay. Question number 12: What is the total funding available? Funding information is not available. It is the responsibility of the contractor to propose how and what their program will consist of, as well as proposing the total cost required to operate a program of this magnitude.

Okay. Question 13: Are there funding--a similar question. Are there funding floors and/or ceilings? It appears that the BOP wants the proposer to set daily rates and determine the funding. Same answer, funding information is not available and it's also the responsibility of the contractor to propose how and what their program will consist of, as well as proposing the total cost required to operate a program of this magnitude.

MS. ELY: Can I interject something?

MS. BECK: Sure. Go ahead.

MS. ELY: I just want to mention, too, that I know a lot of you work in grants and programs in that area. This is a contract. And we go out and competitively bid our contract. And the proposals then drive the price and the best value for the government. So it's a little bit different than a grant. We're not sending out a grant and saying here's your money, tell us what you can do. We're sending out a statement of work and you're proposing to us how you're going to accomplish this and what your cost is to accomplish

this. So under a contract it is competitive and it's driven by the market. Okay. Just to make that a little bit clearer.

MS. BECK: Okay.

MR. GLUCK: If I'm loud enough, can I do it from here?

MS. BECK: If he can hear.

MR. MOORE: If a contractor submits a proposal, I take it the only intelligent way to do it nowadays is with a pretty good size spread sheet attached, and there are items in the spread sheet, for example, that are built into the budget that are not allowable because of either obvious a mistake on the part of the proposer or the bidder, but let's say you're otherwise enamored with the contract, is it your practice to simply say, you know, these are line item vetoed or deleted. And if you then proceed, want to, you could proceed to award the contract based upon what's left assuming that you remove the objectionable items if that was your desire? I mean, if that is the--

MS. BECK: We'd have to go through discussions with the contractor as well to address that.

MR. MOORE: So if you find items in a budget, for example, that are not--that don't belong there, it would be your practice to communicate with the bidder?

MS. BECK: Yes. Definitely.

MR. MOORE: And say, look, why don't you work this over and resubmit it without these things? All right. That makes a lot of sense. Thank you.

MS. BECK: Mm-hum. Any other questions? Go ahead.

MR. VICE: Just to follow up on that previous question. Are we required to submit a budget with this? I don't see that as a requirement in here anywhere. You're asking for a pricing schedule; right?

MS. BECK: Yes.

MS. JOHNS: Right.

MS. BECK: I was kind of interpreting that as the same thing.

MR. VICE: But no budget?

MS. BECK: Right.

MR. VICE: Okay.

MS. BECK: You just need to include your pricing schedule for the base year and the following option years.

MR. VICE: Okay. Thanks.

MR. MOORE: Could you tell me the difference between a pricing schedule and a budget?

MS. BECK: Jan, do you want to?

MS. JOHNS: Well, it could be your budget, you know, what you would budget to run a program or the same thing for the monthly operating cost of operating that program.

MS. ELY: For you, as a contractor, it's your budget. For us, it's the price you're charging us. So your budget, whatever it is going to take you to operate that program is your operating cost, which is our price for obtaining your service.

MR. MOORE: So you're just interested in the bottom line; is that what you're saying?

MS. ELY: Well, I don't know exactly what's written in there as far as what you have to provide.

MS. BECK: You've seen the pricing schedule that was in there.

MR. MOORE: Yes.

MS. BECK: We want to know what your costs are for operating that program. And if you want to detail it out and give us, you know, what each portion of it is, because you're going to give your staff a plan--

MR. MOORE: I can detail it down to a bottlecap, down to the bottlecaps if it's, if you want that kind of detail. But from the prior questioner's question, I take it the word budget is a term of art and pricing schedule is a term of art.

MS. BECK: Right.

MR. MOORE: And they're not the same. And I just wanted to know what the difference was.

MS. BECK: Well, basically, we want to see what that monthly operating cost is.

MR. MOORE: So you want to see a budget then. All right. Thank you.

MS. BECK: Any other questions? Okay.

Question 14: How does the contractor envision the staffing pattern for this program? Also it is the responsibility of the contractor to propose how and what their program will consist of, and that includes any sort of staffing plans required to operate this program. Questions?

[No response.]

MS. BECK: The last question is also similar: Are there required staffing patterns? It appears that the BOP is asking the proposer to determine and

explain the staffing ratios and patterns. The same answer as before, it is the responsibility of the contractor to propose how and what their program will consist of, which includes the staffing plans that are required to operate this program.

Go ahead.

MR. GLUCK: I noticed in the RFP that prisoners will still be involved in four hours a day for their regular work, regular work activities. Will this be com--I believe I read that. Don't prisoners have to work? Doesn't it say there's a four hour work in the RFP?

MR. MORTON: Four hours? I thought you said 40. I'm sorry.

MR. GLUCK: Is the contractor involved in this at all? Is this work going to be happening within the unit or is it going to be out, you know, the places where they mow the lawns and places where they help in the kitchen? How do we incorporate that four hour time into our program in advance? Because the work schedule of prisoners is very varied, as all of you know.

MR. MORTON: In your proposal, I would hope that you would be able to outline how many workers you would want in your unit that would be receiving some type of incentive wage for their work up to four hours a day. You may want to outline that in your proposal. And then there will be other jobs in the larger institution where inmates could work up to four hours a day and also receive those incentive wages while they are working there. So that would be something that you would want to address in your proposal saying that you would like to have so many inmate workers working within the context of that unit.

MS. VANBAALEN: I think, though, that what you're asking is, is everybody going to work a different four hours?

MR. GLUCK: Well, they are. We know how BOP works. There's somebody working in the kitchen, somebody out doing the lawns, you know, it depends, you know, where the environment is. And if I, if I was planning an activity that took place every day between 9:00 and 11:00 and that was actually kitchen duty, how would we plan this?

MS. VANBAALEN: Well, the program assignment, their program assignment will be to the program.

MR. MORTON: That's right.

MS. VANBAALEN: However, they will--

MR. GLUCK: Their work assignment--

MS. VANBAALEN: No. No. They will be employed four hours, that is, not during the program assignment time generally. Now, there have been times when there have to be adjustments made to that. And that would be, you'd have to work that out with the staff in the institution to ensure that they were free from work at the time that your program components are being presented. Which leaves four hours from, say, 9:00 to 1:00 in the morning or midnight or early

kitchen or things like--or morning. I mean, for example, you could leave the whole morning free of programming so that the inmates would have their half day work assignment in the morning.

MR. GLUCK: Right. That's the easy solution. Right.

MS. VANBAALEN: And, and that would be the ideal. And the goal would be to have all of the inmates involved in the program working at the same time. It doesn't work perfectly, but it--they still could protect the program hours.

MR. GLUCK: So we should look to that as the goal and see what--

MS. VANBAALEN: I think that you need to look to that and that there would be a four hour block of time, either morning or afternoon when there wouldn't be group programming. But that those who, you know, so that the majority of them would be working during that time. Is that helpful?

MR. GLUCK: Yes. That is.

MS. VANBAALEN: Now, that doesn't mean every single inmate is going to have that assignment. There's another piece besides work and that is that inmates who have not completed their education have to go to school. But we can, we're able to arrange it that they can only go, that they only have to go half time. So those, those are the kinds of things, if you can keep that in mind, it will be helpful in maintaining the integrity of your group.

MR. GLUCK: Are we still going down your list or are we--

MS. BECK: We're done now. We're going to go ahead and take a break.

MR. WORTHLEY: I have another question on this.

MS. BECK: Do you have another question on that?

MR. WORTHLEY: Yeah. The Bureau has Unicolor and inmates are applying to Unicolor for learning job skills, etcetera. Is it possible for participants inside this type of a program to split a position with Unicolor or in Unicolor?

MR. MORTON: We do have inmates that work in split positions in Unicolor that are participating in our residential program. So I would see it being consistent.

MR. WORTHLEY: There's another component that you have in this thing, and then it's some type of community participation but it has to be done within the confines of confinement. Is there capability in some of these to bring in another type of job skill that could be just for the people who are part of the program?

MR. MORTON: Where they would be paid to do community service?

MR. WORTHLEY: No. Well, if, for example, they were doing something for Habitat for Humanity, or something like that, but they were just doing it, some of that from inside the institution?

MS. VANBAALEN: Yeah.

[Off microphone.]

MR. GLUCK: I have a question for our DOJ representatives. According to the RFP, it sounds like we must insure ourselves completely and indemnify the United States Government of any legal liabilities. My question is, for example, a lawsuit that might come to us based on separation of church and state. Say, for example, a deep pocket organization, like the ACLU, would sue us as contractor, together with you. I think you can afford to defend that, you have attorneys. That's something that I don't think we could even buy enough insurance for to insure against that kind of lawsuit. I'd like to propose that you consider that the constitutional aspects of this program be the BOP's and DOJ's responsibility and not the contractor.

MR. WORTHLEY: Is it possible to have a break?

MS. BECK: Sure. We can do a 10 minute break. Is that okay with everybody?

[Recess.]

MS. JOHNS: Do we want to get started again?

MS. BECK: Let's reconvene.

[Discussion off the record.]

MS. BECK: This year that's going to be taken under advisement in the community services.

MS. JOHNS: Okay. Before we get started with any other questions, we'd like to clarify a couple of things. The last question that was brought up by the gentleman about the constitutional aspects and the responsibility of the DOJ and the BOP, we'll have to look into that and see what needs to be done. The other question that was brought up about bringing, like if they did service for Habitat for Humanity, or something like that, we cannot pay inmates for doing community service. However, if this was a recognized and certified VT program through the institution, they could be signed up through that and then, because VT program is like a job assignment. So they could be paid if it was done through that, but just as a community service there's nothing for us to pay the inmates for, for that type of a thing. But if it would be brought in under our VT program and it would be a certified VT program, then they could be paid because that would be like a job assignment for them.

MS. VANBAALEN: Could I just add to that? There are, in the Bureau of Prisons, already community service projects for which inmates are not paid, but that, for example, do painting or construction, small construction of parts for houses for habitat, for example. And those could count toward a community service project if the contractor chose to bring it in as a community service project, not a paid program, but as a community service project.

MR. MOORE: Are you taking general questions now?

MS. JOHNS: Yes.

MS. BECK: Discussion.

A moment of silence.

MR. MOORE: Again, for the record, I'm Bob Moore with the Aleph Institute. On page three of attachment two, about a little more than halfway down the page it reads as follows: The contractor and any personnel contractor volunteer working in the program must strictly adhere to BOP policies and procedures regarding safety, conduct, and the custody and inmates. Additionally, all contractors and vendors involved in the program will be held to BOP standards of employee conduct and responsibility. Then it goes on to say, all contacts with inmates and their families outside program hours and post completion of the residential program will be reported to a designated BOP employee. And then it spells out consequences for failure to adhere to those principles. The Aleph Institute has been around for almost a quarter of a century. And we have been and are--and consider ourselves to be probably the number one Jewish prisoner advocacy group in the country, not--and thankfully, we don't spend most of our time dealing with the BOP because we think that you do religion really well, all things considered. The vast majority of our resources are taken up dealing with state DOCs and trying to bring them up to your standards, which is not an easy task. However, our first and foremost goal is advocacy on behalf of Jewish inmates. And I don't see the Aleph Institute giving that up as a price to pay to become a contractor in a particular facility or in a dorm at a particular facility. And so when I read a statement like this that says, all contacts with inmates, I must tell you that the Aleph Institute on a daily basis must get 20 to 30 letters, 20 to 30 calls from inmates and families, many of whom are BOP residents. A typical example is one that we're working on right now. Somebody, a father who is in a camp in South Florida with less than six months left to do on his time. His son--excuse me--daughter--I can't remember if it's son or daughter, just passed away and he wants to go home with his son for a few days to mourn. And we're vigorously trying to get this man a furlough. I mean, we're advocating it. We're trying to shake the brushes to make it happen. Whether it will happen or not is another story. That's definitely up to the local people it seems to me. But that's not something we could give up ever to run a facility in New Jersey or South Carolina. And so this kind of brings me back to my urine testing question. You know, we would have no difficulty as an organization saying to you that anybody who directly participates in this program or who volunteers to participate in the program must comply to the letter with these regulations, just as they must provide a urine sample once a year. But that our organization, as a whole, certainly could not or would not agree to report inmate contact with our organization as a price to become a contractor with the BOP. See what I'm saying? I don't know if I've made it clear enough. I can be clearer if you prefer.

MS. JOHNS: Well--

MR. MOORE: It seems to me that--

MS. JOHNS: I understand what the Aleph Institute does. But if you were to have the contract with us--

MR. MOORE: Yes.

MS. JOHNS: --then the program that we're offering would not be advocacy for inmates.

MR. MOORE: Of course not.

MS. JOHNS: It would be to operate these. And so nobody involved could be working as an advocate for inmates.

MR. MOORE: Absolutely understood. And that would make a lot of sense.

MS. JOHNS: Because that would be a conflict.

MR. MOORE: That would make a lot of sense. So what we're really saying, then, it seems to me is that the people who will be directly involved in this program may not engage in advocacy, must report inmate contact or family of inmate contact, just like they must provide a urine specimen once a year. But that the larger institution, the larger organization, the parent or the mother company, as it were, would not be prohibited from engaging in advocacy? Or then we have to get behind some fictional, you know, corporate spinoff and create a subsidiary and operate it under some kind of a corporate shell game. I mean, we would like to be as transparent as possible about this. And, but the price of giving up advocacy on behalf of inmates is something that we would never agree to as an organization to provide this type of service, but could definitely agree that those who participate directly, who run it, who are involved in the day-to-day administration would be banned from those activities. And that would be a reasonable price to pay.

MS. VANBAALEN: There's one issue here that I think has to be addressed or at least has to be named. And that is that the information can't be passed on from a person involved in the program to a person not involved in the program to do the efficacy work. Because that--

MR. MOORE: Well, give me an example? Can you give me an example?

MS. VANBAALEN: Yes. That's an easy example. You hear through someone here through the program that this or this happened and calls the Aleph and says, here's an inmate who needs some advocacy work because this is his need and--

MR. MOORE: Well, what you're saying to me--let me just, let me rephrase that. It seems to me that if an Aleph, whether it's Aleph or one of our, somebody that we designate is working at--and I'm just going to pick Fort Dix, because I like the sound of it, not because I have any indication of where the Jewish program would be, but let's just say Fort Dix. And we're running the program and one of our staffers hears that an inmate's father has passed away and the inmate is desperate to get a furlough to go home and stay at his mother's side during the funeral. Now, that Aleph employee would be prohibited from doing any type of lobbying on behalf of that inmate to get him a furlough. But you're also saying that that employee could not tell the Aleph Institute that this individual has a problem like any other individual in the prison system might have and that we would be, as an organization, prohibited from, from trying to help that person get a furlough to go home for a funeral? I don't understand that. That doesn't sound right to me.

MS. VANBAALEN: I guess what I'm trying to say is that if you accept a contract that to use the contract information to hand on to an advocacy group would not be appropriate.

MR. MOORE: Yea. I would certainly think that it would be totally inappropriate for, let's say, the Aleph Institute to ask members of this-- let's say the group that were running a program like this to say, by the way, when you get a chance and you get into the BOP computers, check out such and such and this and this. That would be totally wrong and that's to me black and white. But the example that you gave, the example that I'm giving, to me, are very, very gray areas. And I don't see that as black and white at all, respectfully, Chaplain VanBaalén. However, I'm not saying that, you know, that we couldn't abide by rules such as that if they were imposed upon us. But that would be certainly something I would want to know more about. It seems to me that motive has a lot to do with this. And the mere fact that an advocacy group may continue to engage in ongoing advocacy procedures on behalf of a cognizable group of inmates should not be a basis, it seems to me, to disqualify that organization from running a discrete program in a particular institution so long as there is no improper, you know, cross pollination, for lack of a more descriptive term.

MS. VANBAALEN: It seems to me that where the rubber meets the road here is what would be improper. And I think that there are instances where information that has--there are issues of privacy, there are issues of conflict of interest that might prohibit some communication with advocates if, in fact, you are working for the Bureau of Prisons or an organization is working for the Bureau of Prisons. And I can't say more about that now, because I just don't know what more there is to say.

MR. MOORE: Well--

MS. VANBAALEN: But it's likely that there could be conflicts of interest and contractors cannot engage in--your reference to create a shell organization, or something, suggests that this is--that we're setting up some kind of a barrier that isn't fair. And I think that it's really important to understand that the program, once you become employed or contracted with the Bureau of Prisons you adhere to what the Bureau of Prisons requires. And if it requires that you avoid situations where there is a conflict of interest, then you would have to do that. I'm not, I'm trying to be as clear as I can be on this issue. But I can't, I don't know what else there is to say.

MR. MOORE: Well, I--since this really goes to the heart of our organization even beginning to consider participation and since, among other things, we believe that it's important that we at least have a fair shot at consideration in this proposal if we decide to go forward with it, permit me, if you will to just take it one step further. Seems to me that what we're getting at here is the definition of words like you and organization. And by that, I mean, when the Aleph Institute, as an organization, submits a bid, we would prefer to do so in the most transparent form possible, which would mean that we submit it in our name, not in some educational institute that is spun off from the Aleph Institute. And in the same vein that the response to my earlier inquiry about the urine testing, which I thought went really to the heart of this issue, and that is who is really working for you? The ten people that are on the site doing the job or the mother organization back at home, if there is a mother

organization. In our case, there would be. And we would certainly have no difficulty taking those ten employees and subordinating them 100 percent to BOP procedures, policies, loyalty oaths, or whatever was required, and have them operate under procedures that are 100 percent in accord with what you feel is proper. But we would not, as an organization, agree to have our hands tied as an advocacy group as a condition to get this contract.

MS. VANBAALEN: I believe that what I said is, if you receive information from the program--while involved in the program, if a person receives information as a result of employment as a contractor that it would not be appropriate for you to pick up the phone and say, look, I can't advocate for this so you do it.

MR. MOORE: That would be like somebody calling Catholic Charities and saying that, we've got a problem here with a person in the Catholic faith who needs help in his religious community. Can you please help him out? I mean, what's the difference?

MS. VANBAALEN: Well, I can't address the issue. I simply can't say more about it, except that what the requirement is here.

MR. MOORE: Yes.

MS. VANBAALEN: Is that it be reported. We're not saying you can't do it. We're saying that it be reported.

MR. MOORE: We would have no problem reporting it. The question is, who must report and what must be reported. If it's the ten people we're talking about and anything that affects them, no issue. It's just a no brainer. But if it means if we get a phone call from an inmate in California to our Miami office saying that, you know, he wants to get a furlough because his father died and we're talking to somebody in San Diego that has absolutely nothing to do with what's going on in the northeast, why would that ever have to be reported? I guess what I'm really saying is this. At some point, perhaps, we could try and fine tune this and find out just really if it's possible to draw some guidelines as to what's appropriate here. Because to me it's still a very gray area. And what I hear coming from Chaplain VanBaalen is that our organization, meaning the Aleph Institute, based in Miami Beach, Florida is the contractor and that we would be bound by these rules just like the ten people who are working on site. And, to me, that poses great barriers.

MS. VANBAALEN: I don't believe that's what I said.

MR. MOORE: I'm not saying you did. I'm saying it's what I'm hearing. And I'm not putting words in your mouth. I'm putting words in my ears. And there is a difference. So, perhaps, if I've developed some sensitivity to this issue, someone might be willing to address it. Thank you.

MS. BECK: And that will have to be discussed and addressed accordingly.

MS. JOHNS: Yeah. We'll have to look into that. But the main thing is, is there could be no perception of conflict of interest between the contract program and the advocacy.

MR. MOORE: Absolutely. I think that could be accomplished, quite honestly, without a problem.

MS. JOHNS: I have a feeling we'll have to talk to our legal people about that too.

MR. MOORE: Sure.

MR. WORTHLEY: I would assume that the HCFA laws still apply too in this particular situation.

MS. JOHNS: Yes.

MR. WORTHLEY: And their laws as well. The question I have is related to the deadline date. You've done a wonderful service in providing the service here of recording everything and then putting it on a PDF file so that we could have access to it. And you said it would not be available for about eight days or so. Which puts us right at the weekend that you're requiring to have materials in. I would like to request that there be an extension given on this deadline.

MS. JOHNS: It's definitely going to be discussed. And it will be, in order to meet our deadlines of when we're suppose to have this in order and everything--

MR. WORTHLEY: Who set the deadline on that in house?

MS. JOHNS: Well, we're going by the President's management agenda, you know, the guidelines that are set out through that. And we're trying to follow them as closely as possible. In order for us to meet that, about the most we could extend this would be two weeks, which would push us back to approximately May 16th. And we don't have any problem with that. And I don't believe the program office does either to where we could push it back to that. That we can put out prior to us receiving this. If we're going to extend the deadline, we can go ahead and do amendments on Fedbizopps to extend the date. I'm seeing a lot of shaking of heads, so it seems like that's--

MR. VICE: A good idea.

MS. JOHNS: Smiles on everybody's faces now.

MR. DOLPHUS: So is it possible that that means that the award date would come later than July?

MS. JOHNS: Well, our award date should be by the end of our third quarter, which is actually the end of June.

MR. DOLPHUS: Okay.

MS. JOHNS: I know in that pre-solicitation it was anticipated, but like that's just anticipation. We are going to try and follow the date of the end of third quarter.

MR. DOLPHUS: Reverend Warren Dolphus, President National Alliance of Faith and Justice. My question is, having heard that question and going back to the question that was raised through Chaplain Morton on request for visiting one of the Life Connections site, we have a very unique request is that next week my board would be meeting in Richmond, Virginia. And you have a Life Connections Site in Petersburg, Virginia about 20 minutes, or so, from there. And is it possible to put a request in and get it approved within a week's time frame?

MS. JOHNS: Well, the thing is--

MR. DOLPHUS: Because we would really like to see, after talking with colleagues here and members that we would like to see really what's, you know, actually involved in the Life Connection program.

MS. JOHNS: Well, to do the site visit, that has to be open to each and every one of you, including people that are not here today.

MR. DOLPHUS: Sure.

MS. JOHNS: That would prefer to attend that site visit. So that would--

MS. BECK: Would have to be coordinated.

MS. JOHNS: That would have to be coordinated with one of the institutions because we wouldn't be going, it would be--

MR. DOLPHUS: Sure.

MS. JOHNS: --not feasible to visit, you know, have some group go to this site and some go--it would be one site would have to be picked. And that's where everybody would have to go.

MR. DOLPHUS: Oh, one site.

MS. JOHNS: Yeah.

MS. VANBAALEN: Am I correct that we would all go together?

MS. JOHNS: Yes. Go at one time.

MS. VANBAALEN: I mean, anybody that was interested would go at one time?

MR. DOLPHUS: So having heard that response, then, is it possible that you could do that within the eight days that you're talking about getting us the other information? Because we're only right now at least a little over two weeks out from the May 2nd--

MS. JOHNS: I'm afraid that might even postpone some things even further. Because, you know, we'd have to clear it. I mean, the program office would have to clear all of that and get it set up. And we'd have to get it posted out there for people to be aware of it.

MR. DOLPHUS: Really?

MS. JOHNS: Yes. All of this has to be posted. For anybody that's not here today, it has to be posted back on the Fedbizopps website so they have the information available. We have to have a level playing field for everybody

MR. DOLPHUS: Right. I guess I was just thinking the level playing field would be that if we could visit any, any site based upon your approval in terms of whoever may want to go and visit. Because it's kind of inconvenient for everybody to have to go to one particular area when you have several, several Life Connections sites. Why not be able to say--

MS. JOHNS: Well, but a contracting officer and one program officer have to be there also.

MR. DOLPHUS: Okay.

MS. BECK: Just to preserve the procurement integrity and to make sure that something is not said at one institution that might not have been said at that institution. So if we have it all at one, we have more control basically.

MR. DOLPHUS: Okay. All right.

MS. JOHNS: And like Darlene said earlier, you know, our Life Connections 1 program, it's not, you're not comparing apples and apples here. Our Life Connections 2 program is a different program completely.

MR. DOLPHUS: So when you're saying, and I heard that earlier, what is the primary difference between the residential program--which I know it means residential living in the area, is that the main difference between Life Connections 1 and 2 in terms of this program, in terms of the residential program?

MS. JOHNS: Life Connections 2, the contractor will be running the program. You're going to propose everything. You're going to propose the courses or the classes, the groups, spiritual groups, whatever, you're going to propose it all. It is your program.

MR. DOLPHUS: Right.

MS. JOHNS: You're just operating it in our institution. Whereas, our Life Connections 1 program is operated by our chaplaincy department.

MS. VANBAALEN: A rather major thing is that it's multi-faithed, that participants in the Life Connections program. In one program we may have Buddhists, Moslems, Jews, Christians, all involved in the same program. So that's another major difference than yours--when I say yours, that a contractor's program would be--although there might be people of various faiths in it, they would be committing to a program that is geared toward a particular faith perspective.

MR. DOLPHUS: Okay. My last question. With much attention now going to re-entry all across the country. Are there any preclusions in terms of this solicitation for the awardee as the contractor networking and even partnering

with government agencies, state agencies, or local agencies in terms of what we do toward re-entry and working together in a particular area?

MS. JOHNS: That's totally up to you as the contractor.

MR. DOLPHUS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BECK: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): From what I read of the RFP and the guidelines, the decision as to an applicant to join a particular program, and as you said there might be a few Christian groups that get the contract, maybe a Jewish group that will get the contract. That the decision will be up to the BOP as to which inmates are accepted into a particular program. Is that--that's correct?

MR. GLUCK: That's not what it says in the--it says that it's a joint decision.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): A joint decision between the program and BOP.

MS. BECK: BOP has the final decision. But a contractor would make their recommendations, and we would just have the final determination.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Okay. You would have the final determination to negate somebody from going to a program. Would the contractor also be able to nix a particular applicant, even if the BOP approved?

MR. MORTON: The contractor would be able to talk with the contracting officer's technical representative there at the institution to discuss, you know, an applicant who makes application to go to the program. And, of course, you know, that discussion would bring forth what your objections are for the inmate being a part of that program. And there would be more discussion after that concerning the request and the approval of the request. But, yes, we would listen to the contractor in regard to, you know, our problem with an inmate that has requested to be a part of the program.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): And would there be a similar process if after the program was started some time into the program where the contractor felt that the, a particular participant should be removed? Would it be the same thing?

MR. MORTON: Those types of discussions will take place, of course. If an inmate is not doing what they are suppose to be doing in the program, first we would want the contractor and the staff of that contract group to work with the inmate in helping the inmate to accept responsibility for the programming that they've signed up for.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): I see. Now--

MR. MORTON: Owning responsibility is a part of the program I suspect.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): The application process for an inmate to join a program, is that going to be drafted by the contractors or is that going to be from the BOP or is it going to be a joint application where the BOP will have

certain criterion that they want the inmate to submit on the application, and on the same application the contractor will be put his section as well? Is that how you anticipate that an application will look?

MR. MORTON: The contractor will draw up the application for the inmate so that they can fill out the information that the contractor is asking for. And then, of course, the contractor will have a section there to put their recommendation for the request. Now, of course, whenever an inmate makes an application for a residential program, it has to go through the unit team at the institution where the inmate is being housed. Also, it has to go through the associate warden who gives the approval for the inmate to participate in the program. And the final approval comes from the warden there at the scene of the institution. So, I mean, it's all in concert. When the inmate makes application for the program, then it will go to the unit team so that that application will be processed.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): I understand that perfectly well. But since this is a faith-based program and a single faith-based program, for example, would it be proper for the application to have specific questions about religious observance and interest--

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Okay.

MR. MORTON: Yes. You want to know as much about the applicant as you possibly can and how they will fit into the program that you propose.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Thank you.

MR. MORTON: And the other things too, like RFP.

MR. COX: I have a technical question. On the solicitation form page 3 of 30-

MS. JOLLY: Sorry. Can't hear you.

MR. COX: On the solicitation contractor form, page 3 of 30, it says proposals submitted in response to the solicitation shall consist of the following. And I understand that shall doesn't mean maybe. It means shall. And it identifies one of the things that shall be committed, attachment number six, which is credentials of religious services contractor. If you go to appendix 6, it is a personal profile application. And my question is, do you anticipate us submitting the names of individual employees at the time of the solicitation or does this personal profile have to do with a member of the submitting organization or exactly what is your expectation regarding this particular requirement and this particular form?

MS. JOHNS: For each individual that you would propose as being a staff member or an employee under you, if they are faith-based affiliated with someone, then they would be required to fill out this form. Now--correct, David? I'm not incorrect?

MR. MORTON: You're correct. The individuals who will be working in the confines of the institution and in that faith-based program would fill out the credentialing form.

MR. COX: But if those persons have not been identified or hired at the time of the proposal submission, it would not be required; is that correct?

MR. MORTON: That's correct.

MS. JOHNS: It would be required before performance.

MR. COX: Understood. By the individual?

MR. MORTON: Yes, by the individual.

MS. JOHNS: Prior to performance beginning.

MR. COX: My other question relates to attachment 2, page 7. At the bottom of the page it says, all program staff must attend the required contractor institutional familiarization training, etcetera, and etcetera. Can you give us an idea of the length of that training?

MS. JOHNS: It's four hours.

MR. COX: Okay.

MS. VANBAALEN: Four hours.

MR. MORTON: It is four hours.

MS. VANBAALEN: Four hours the first year and I believe it's either four hours annually or--

MR. MORTON: It is four hours annually.

MS. JOHNS: Four hours annually.

MR. COX: It also states that background fingerprint checks, etcetera, may take up to 90 days. I understand that is in some cases they will. Is there an average less than 90 days that would be reasonable to build into a schedule or should we just accommodate, allow for 90 days after hiring?

MR. MORTON: You should allow for 90 days.

MR. COX: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MORTON: There's really no average, but, you know, up to 90 days.

MR. COX: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VICE: Hi. A follow-on question regarding the background investigation and the time to assume for hiring to me dovetails, I'd like some clarification about the contract award and the start-up schedule. I think there's been a couple of questions asked about that. One of them is if you have a target

award date of June 30th. Is that right? I thought I heard that earlier. Okay. And then there is a three months ramp up period. My question is, does that ramp up period start at contract award?

MS. JOHNS: There will be a notice to proceed issued.

MR. VICE: So we'll have some program preparation time between contract award and the first entity notice to proceed?

MS. JOHNS: I would anticipate that there would be some. Probably to get this program up and running, maybe two weeks. I mean, that's just anticipated, you know.

MR. VICE: I guess to take that back to my original comment about the 90 days. You know, unless you have staff hired and approved, you've got 90 days right out of the gate just on the fingerprints that you might be risking. And then you have much more extensive background, I mean, there are other things in the background approval process besides that, that could add additional time to that. So, I mean, if you're requiring that at the initial notice to proceed that all that be done, it kind of squeezes us. I mean, I don't know how feasible that becomes unless you're asking us to start that now before the award. Which is, you know, maybe that's what you're doing.

MS. JOHNS: No. We're not asking for it to be done prior to award. That would be an awful lot of work.

MR. VICE: You understand my question, though, right? You start trying to lay out a--

MS. JOHNS: Right.

MR. VICE: --flow chart for this of how this is going to work.

MS. JOHNS: I think what we were thinking was that during the three month ramp up period for your staff--

MR. VICE: So you could also be qualifying and hiring staff during that period?

MS. JOHNS: Mm-hum

MR. VICE: Okay. I just wanted to know if you all made that assumption.

MS. JOHNS: Right.

MR. VICE: Okay. So you have that time. You might have three and-a-half months or something, maybe, whatever it works out to be to have the staff in place and prepared and the actual program starts, that is inmate participation would begin at the end of that period.

MS. JOHNS: Right.

MR. VICE: Okay. All right. That's good. Just a couple other questions. Just a point of clarification in reference to the submittal of the plans,

policies, and procedures. At the top of page 4 it says all plans, policies, and procedures shall be developed by the contractor and submitted with the contractor's proposal. I believe Mr. Morton, when he was discussing this early on in the conference said, and used the term outline. And I don't mean to be mincing words here, but there's a difference between a policy and procedure manual and an outline of that stuff. So just my request is that we clarify the scope of that response. It could be very different.

MR. MORTON: I would like to have policies and procedures as opposed to an outline.

MR. VICE: I just want to be clear.

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. VICE: I mean, you were talking, I understand that. I just wanted to make sure what you're saying.

MR. MORTON: Right.

MR. VICE: Thank you. On the top of page 6 under the post release phase, it says that this phase shall last six months after release from the BOP incarceration. However, the cost shall be incurred during the residential phase. Can you clarify what you mean by the cost shall be incurred during the residential phase?

MS. JOHNS: Well, that should be built into your operating cost.

MR. VICE: Okay. So any cost to provide the services.

MS. JOHNS: What you anticipate the cost to run those six months.

MR. VICE: Built into the per diem?

MS. JOHNS: Mm-hum.

MR. VICE: Okay. All right. That also brings up the issue of the scope of accountability. Are you saying that we're responsible--you talk about, use the term a verifiable connection between the participation and a congregation or support group at the release destination. The way we discussed this is that some of these participants could participate in the program at one of the target sites and then be transferred to a release destination pretty far away. That we're responsible for managing that six month period after release and maintaining that relationship or are we responsible for providing a documented referral to an organization at that release site, two very different possible scopes?

MR. MORTON: We would like for the referral to be made and we would also like there to be some maintenance done with that so that that relationship continues. When an inmate steps out of the door, that referral is made. They know who that contact is in the public. And there's some training for that mentor on the outside to know what mentoring is about from the organization's perspective, you know, training the mentors how to be mentors would be an

important thing so they can understand what you're trying to do through your program and extend it out to them.

MR. VICE: Okay. So as a follow-up, are you saying then that, again, this has to do with what we're accountable for at those release sites. I'm trying to get clear about what your expectations and requirements are. You're saying that us, as the potential offerer or contractor, that those are our volunteers at that site? That we're responsible for providing mentors at every release location that would occur?

MR. MORTON: Wherever the inmate might go we would want you to be responsible for that, wherever they go.

MR. VICE: Okay.

MR. MORTON: Mentors should be in place for them whenever they step out the door.

MR. VICE: All right. Okay. Thanks. That's it. Thank you.

MR. WORTHLEY: The Bureau of Prisons works underneath the Justice Department. When the inmates are leaving the system and they're still on what we used to call paper time, they're now under somebody else's jurisdiction. What type of a relationship have you built with the folks in the probation and parole, the old probation and parole aspect of this thing? And what expectations will they have, this type of program? And how has that been working with your Life Connections 1?

MR. MORTON: We have had communication with probation and parole and they're aware of our program. They're aware of the operations memorandum that we're governed by. And our CCC folks have done a good job of also gaining information and giving information to the CCC, halfway houses, and such, so that whenever an inmate leaves our system, it's a pretty clean hand off. And we're going to have to make the probation and parole folks aware of this new program, of this new initiative so that they can embrace it like they did the first program. So I don't anticipate any issues, you know, it's clear communication and making them aware of the program that's going to take place. The CCCs are no longer CCCs. They're residential re-entry programs. So they've changed their name.

MR. COWLEY: We assume that all the wardens at the six locations have been made aware that they may soon be the lucky ones to get these programs. And we all know that wardens march right along with the system and do everything they're told. However, there may be a time when there is some conflict between the contractor and the warden. How much advocacy may we expect from the Chaplaincy Department to be a buffer or supportive or are we all riding in this boat together? So where are you at in relationship to the warden?

MR. MORTON: Are you asking--

MR. COWLEY: I'm asking. I think it will probably take all three of you.

MR. MORTON: I'll start. We're dedicated to this program and we want it to work. Now, you know, whenever there's a problem whenever you're dealing with

a contractual government exchange, you've always got that contracting representative there in the institution that will be talking with the contractor along the way. That relationship is a very important relationship. When it deals with contractual things, that's that person that needs to be talked with. Of course, you know, if there comes an issue with a warden or an associate warden or our staff, the contractor should be talking with that representative there in the institution to kind of oversee stuff. So communication is a very important thing. As far as advocacy as from my perspective, as far as the program, we want to see this program succeed. We want to partner with you to do the right thing and provide a viable, quality program for the inmates.

MR. COWLEY: This is different. I mean, this is new.

MR. MORTON: It's new. It's brand new.

MR. COWLEY: And so when I call Susan, for example--

MS. VANBAALEN: I'm going to refer you to David.

MR. COWLEY: And then I'll call David or Bruce and then I'll call David. And will I hear, you'll just need to talk to the warden about that?

MR. MORTON: You probably won't hear that.

MR. COWLEY: Okay.

MR. MORTON: You probably won't hear that. You may. It depends on what the situation is.

MR. COWLEY: But, okay. Yeah. There's all kinds of issues.

MR. MORTON: By the way, I am the contracting officer's technical representative in the central office. I'll be working with this contract with the contracting theme. So, I mean--

MR. COWLEY: But you know what I mean. I mean, you all been around corrections. You know what I'm talking about. Each facility is different and the physical plant is different. So if we, I have been to Seagoville 100 years ago. I haven't been to Hazelton. So you're asking us to bid on a physical plant sight unseen with the hope that there's plenty of space, the flow is adequate because some of that will have to do with staffing patterns. So let's say we bid it. I assume we're not going to be able to have site visits. It's sort of like going to see the Life Connection 1 that would be correct, I mean, that's not possible?

MS. JOHNS: We haven't built that into our time frame.

MR. COWLEY: Right. So we're going to have to just do it. Let's say that we get a unit and the letter goes out. And then we go to that unit and we say, this is totally not acceptable. At that time, as a contractor, I can say I do not wish to participate in this activity. That's a question.

MS. JOHNS: So you're saying after we award the contract--

MR. COWLEY: Because--

MS. JOHNS: You want to get out of it?

MR. COWLEY: Well, that's correct. Because if it may depend--the physical plant may depend on if I need two counselors or three because of the layout. I may have one huge group room where I can hold one group meeting or they may say, we don't have a big room to hold that many. You're going to have to do it in three. Which means now I've got to hire three counselors, perhaps. So that all depends on staffing. So at what point will we say this is not something that we bid for? Help them out, Susan.

MS. JOHNS: Well, it's going to be hard to--if we did any kind of site visit, I mean, we're not talking about six institutions that look the same.

MR. COWLEY: That's right. They don't. They're all different.

MS. VANBAALEN: In terms of space, space is tight.

MR. COWLEY: I know.

MS. VANBAALEN: And so it's conceivable that although there will be office space and programming space that it might not be ideal programming space and office space. We all live with that in the correctional environment.

MR. COWLEY: Sure. And I can live with that too. I'm not talking about that.

MS. VANBAALEN: But I think that the exact contour of each institution or that the exact space, I don't know if it would be possible to get some kind of a layout of the unit or something that could be made available.

MS. JOHNS: We'd have to check to find out about that. I don't know the availability of that.

MS. VANBAALEN: But space will be tight. I mean, I just can't imagine any place where--

MR. COWLEY: I don't have a problem, I don't have a problem with tight space. I have a problem with the layout of the space. And I mean, we're holding groups in hallways. So I don't have a problem with the space. I have a problem with the location of the space and how much, how many staff do I have to hire to cover the location of the space. Which is critical. Or, see, well, anyway. Is there opt out at any time, forgive me for not reading through this entirely, is there an opt out on the Bureau's part and on the contractor's part; is there an opt out clause?

MS. JOHNS: No.

MR. COWLEY: So you've got us for a year, whether or not you want us, and we've got you for a year whether or not we want to stay?

[Discussion off the record.]

MS. JOHNS: The government handles the budgeting.

MR. COWLEY: Well, I mean, other than the budget. Suppose, you know, but you know what I'm saying. Let's say we get there and this just isn't a good fit for you and it's not a good fit for us.

MS. JOHNS: Well, at that point we'd probably have to sit down and negotiate whether we're going to do a termination of some kind.

MR. COWLEY: Okay. But that is a possibility for us. I mean, you wouldn't want to be spending money on a product that wasn't going to be deliverable, I wouldn't think.

MS. JOHNS: No.

MR. COWLEY: I don't want to belabor this on, on the contact for post, post completion contact. We know that the relationships are critical and if somebody is going, if somebody's in Seagoville and they're going to California and they have, we have that set up in California, but still there is that relationship with that mentor back in Seagoville or that staff person back in Seagoville, the way I was reading this is that if we set up that communication that this just says that I report it.

MS. VANBAALEN: Right.

MR. COWLEY: It doesn't say it's not possible. It just says that I report it.

MS. VANBAALEN: That's right. You report it.

MR. MORTON: That's right.

MR. COWLEY: Now, let's say that the person has a mentor, because this talks about volunteers, a mentor inside the program at Seagoville, and he's going to stay in Dallas. Can I simply report that that mentor then is no longer going to be an inside mentor but is now an outside mentor to that individual?

MS. VANBAALEN: I would say yes.

MR. MORTON: You could?

MS. VANBAALEN: Can I just make a comment just to clarify on that reporting? I would envision a form that simply says, name of the contractor, name of the inmate or inmate family, pastoral in nature or vocational in nature, something like that.

MR. COWLEY: Yeah.

MS. VANBAALEN: So that because if reports don't come in, then there's that question of is this an appropriate contact. So that the idea is that the contact is reported to the COTR or whoever is appointed to receive those.

MR. McFARLAND: Can I just ask a couple, three clarifying questions? Because I wasn't clear on that. I'm Steve McFarland with the Justice Department. The mentors post release and what you expect of the contractor to provide in the

way of a referral. You're going to be releasing potentially to every city in the United States depending on who is ultimately selected into the program. So you're not expecting a contractor to have, to be able to prove to you in their submittal that they have a network of synagogues, churches, para church organizations, what have you, in every city in the country, but rather that they're going to make a commitment that they will make an effort to contact someone who is like minded with that participant out in California and try to match him or her up with an orthodox synagogue or a Baptist church and that sort of thing. Is that what you have in mind?

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. McFARLAND: Not the former, but the latter. Okay. Secondly, what is the role going to be of the chaplain? You indicated that the two key differences between Life Connections 1 and 2 are, first of all, that you're moving from multi faith to single faith in a unit. And secondly, that Life Connections 1 is presently contractor, but chaplain led. And you contract certain of the spiritual guides. But this is very hands on chaplain led programming; whereas, this is going to be all the religious programming would be done by the contractor; right? What is the role or would be the role and authority of the on site chaplain, if any, in the religious programming?

MR. MORTON: For that unit?

MR. McFARLAND: For that unit.

MR. MORTON: We had talked in some of our conversations about COTR, on site COTRs, it may rest with the chaplain there at the institution.

MR. McFARLAND: What's a COTR?

MR. MORTON: COTR is the contracting officer's technical representative, the on site representative. It may not be that person at all. The warden may or the business manager, whomever is the one who appoints that person at the on site institution may choose someone else. But it could be the chaplain. I hope, you know, I envision that the chaplain at the institution and the faith-based organization who is providing the residential program will embrace each other and have good communication and be a good example to the inmates that they're serving. So that this communication, inmates will see how they're communicating and they will embrace each other and this program will be a success, not only for the chaplain who is there who is leading the general population, flock, or whatever but also the faith-based organization who is trying to build the program in the chaplain's institution. You know, there may be some recruiting going on in that institution that would bring some of this general population of inmates into that faith-based program. So there has to be some good communication and good relationship going on there.

MR. McFARLAND: But insofar as the contractor is going to be responsible for results, is it fair to say that if in the event of some difference of opinion as to the religious programming with the contractors has made a commitment to provide, that the contractor is urged to, you know, work with the chaplain. But the chaplain may not have a veto over various aspects of the religious programming assuming that there is no security or health issue involved. Is that fair?

MR. MORTON: There is a person that the contractor can communicate to if there is a grievance or a complaint or something that they would like to voice. There is going to be someone there in the institution that they're able to voice that with. And, of course, you know, there is a COTR in the central office. There's contracting officers. The contractor won't have to feel like they're out there by themselves.

MR. McFARLAND: But the chaplain is going to understand that they are in an advisory role and not in a veto role?

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. McFARLAND: Over the religious programming?

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. McFARLAND: Okay. Last question is, in terms of the correctional officers, if the contractor finds that one staff just has an attitude, is not constructive, I assume it's possible for the contractor to suggest, obviously they don't dictate who the staff is, but to suggest to the COTR or the warden or somebody, you know what, this guy is just not conducive to positive results in this unit. Could you reassign him somewhere else?

MR. MORTON: Yes. That type of communication, you know, I would expect.

MR. McFARLAND: Great. Thank you.

MR. WORTHLEY: Who will the COTR be when an inmate is released potentially in a distant place? Who is going to be responsible at that point in time for the programming that will go on six months after release?

MR. MORTON: As far as making sure that that relationship continues?

MR. WORTHLEY: Well, and also to serve as an advocate for the program, making sure that the contractor is able to do their work.

MR. MORTON: The contractor is the mentor on the outside?

MR. WORTHLEY: Yeah.

MR. MORTON: They're not contractors.

MR. WORTHLEY: Well--

MS. VANBAALEN: The contractor that's arranging it.

MR. MORTON: The contractor who is arranging this.

MR. WORTHLEY: Right.

MR. MORTON: The COTR will be that person in the institution to make sure that the contractor is able to do their work.

MR. WORTHLEY: Will they have jurisdiction over the probation and parole office that might be the stumbling block?

MR. MORTON: The staff member would be able to talk with the probation and parole office, I'm sure, to help pave the way.

MS. BECK: I just think we need to look into that a little.

MR. MORTON: We will. We will. But, you know, I think there's a few avenues that are available to make sure.

MR. WORTHLEY: But we're going from one jurisdiction to another, and it doesn't seem to me like there's a real road map that's there for us.

MR. MORTON: Let's look at that. Thank you.

MS. JOLLY: Dr. Juanita Jolly, Chaplain National Alliance for Faith and Justice. A question was asked earlier about the pricing schedule or budget and whether if there were items that were not allowable that would deny the potential contract, then the answer was, no, that those items we would be told to take them out, for example. So alternatively, with regard to not being able to see space in advance and be able to determine appropriate staffing levels based on space, the question is, would there be the potential if a contract were to be awarded, a potential for adjustment for that pricing schedule to accommodate additional staffing based on the needs, the spacial needs, the spacial requirements?

MS. JOHNS: Well, this is going to be a firm fixed price contract. So what you bid and what is awarded will be--

MS. JOLLY: So when, if at any point, will the site visit take place so that the negotiation about or the firming up that submitted price can take place? I mean, if you have space and it has partitions or walls around which you can't see that does definitely require additional staffing. We don't know that. So I'm just asking what accommodation is possible relative to not being able to see space in the moment and submitting a proposal that you're saying is firm?

MS. JOHNS: We may have to look into the issue about this, the layout of the unit. Because that's not been considered at this point.

MR. GLUCK: Is there anything that precludes us from speaking to federal chaplains that we are personally acquainted with at this time to ask them what their opinion is as to the needs of our flock?

MS. JOHNS: You should not be having any contact with anyone other than us at this point in this procurement process.

MR. MOORE: Just a quick question about the use of volunteer ex-offenders. It seems that it's been contemplated that there is a place for ex-offenders in this type of a program, especially if they have successfully transitioned and have some skills to share with other inmates. I take it that the ex-offender aspect applies--it's only mentioned here in respect to volunteers. It's not mentioned in respect to staff. I'm just playing this out in my mind. I don't

envision actually anyone on staff being an ex-offender. But if that were to be the case, would that pose a barrier or an insurmountable problem? It's purely a hypothetical question. I really have nothing in mind at the time.

MR. MORTON: The ex-offender is not on paper. They're off--

MR. MOORE: I would assume that they would have to be off supervision.

MS. VANBAALEN: There are some things that have to be worked out.

MR. MORTON: There are some procedures that we'd have to go through in order to qualify and approve an ex-offender as a staff contract employee.

MS. VANBAALEN: Even as a volunteer.

MR. MOORE: Yeah. Well, I mean, it just says they have to be, go through a security clearance like everyone else. And I assume that the security clearance would reveal whatever the record reflects, I mean, whatever it is, it is. I assume ax murderers are not allowed and that tax evaders might be. But beyond that subtle distinction, there may be more, more stringent requirements.

MS. VANBAALEN: The volunteer requirements for clearance for--

MR. MOORE: Entry and exit.

MS. VANBAALEN: --for entry and exit for ex-offenders is more extensive than those who are not ex-offenders.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

MS. VANBAALEN: So those are, you know, when you ask if there are barriers, there is a more extensive clearance procedure.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

MS. VANBAALEN: For those who are ex-offenders, and some conditions placed on their involvement with inmates.

MR. MOORE: All right. Thank you.

MR. TIMMERMAN: Nathan Timmerman. I understand at the end of the first 12 months there will be an evaluation process and at that time either the contract will be renewed or it will be turned down. Will there be an opportunity to submit a new budget at that time?

MS. BECK: No. Everything is to be submitted with your proposal when you first submit your pricing schedule to lay out the base year and the following option years. And then after the base year, we'll evaluate to see if the services still exist and the funding is available and we'll renew in accordance with what you had submitted with your proposal for the option year.

MR. TIMMERMAN: So basically the first year's budget we lock ourselves into that budget to remain the same over the next five years or--

MS. JOHNS: No. You can build in, you know, price increases when you submit, like, a lot of people do what we call cost of doing business for each option year that they bid on.

MR. TIMMERMAN: Okay.

MS. JOHNS: So your base year, you know, you might chose maybe a 3 percent increase, or something like that. You should build that in as you're preparing your proposal.

MR. TIMMERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): If you do not get all of the contractors that you want in the first round, will you be putting out another RFP, let's say, in six months from now or in a year from now? Or is this, this is sort of like a pilot project and you're putting out the RFP. It's going to cover the next five years, and that's it?

MS. JOHNS: At this point, that's all we anticipate is this current requirement.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): Then I reiterate what some of the others have mentioned here for an extension.

MS. BECK: Anyone else?

MR. McFARLAND: One last question. All of the faith-based groups who would be contractors retain a legal right to choose their employees on the basis of their faith to make sure that they're representative, they share the same faith and world view. Is my understanding correct that they will retain that statutory right to choose on a religiously discriminatory basis, not on any other basis, but a religiously discriminatory basis choose the people that will be running their program; is that correct?

MS. JOHNS: It's the contractor's, you know, it's their employee. So they have the--

MR. McFARLAND: Their employees. They choose. Great. Thanks.

MS. JOHNS: Mm-hum.

MR. TIMMERMAN: Do I understand correctly that six units haven't been--the selection hasn't been finalized or has it been finalized?

MS. JOHNS: We know the six sites. Those were provided in the solicitation.

MR. McFARLAND: It wasn't clear to me whether it was finalized, the decision or not. Those are the six sites.

MS. JOHNS: There are six pilot sites, yes.

MS. BECK: It could be from one to six, depending on what we have funding for. Yes.

MR. MOORE: I wonder if you'll permit me to ask perhaps the most naive question of the evening. And I must confess I have no experience at all in government contracting. So this question is naive, I promise you. Surely, when money was budgeted for this experiment, someone had in mind what the project might cost, and therefore, allocated a certain sum of money to the BOP or to DOJ or however it's done, in line with what they anticipate this might cost. As a potential contractor sitting down and developing a budget, I haven't a clue what this will cost until I look at the bottom line and push add and everything pops out. And then I don't even know whether that will be in the ballpark or not. And so how does a contractor know whether he's even in the ballpark, I mean, or whether he's over the line or way under the line? Or is that just the art of government contracting?

MS. JOHNS: It's kind of the art of government contracting.

MR. MOORE: I mean, how do you hit the mark? Is there any way to just hit it right on? I mean--

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Pray.

MR. MOORE: Pray.

MS. JOHNS: He said pray.

MR. MOORE: Actually, I'm not saying this to be funny. I'm dead, dead serious. Is there any way for us to know or is it public knowledge, for example, to know what has been allocated for this? Is that a proper or a fair question to even ask? I mean, am I allowed to know that?

MS. JOHNS: We don't have, you know, we don't have that information because it depends on what these proposals come in at, you know, if we're going to have all the funds to do all six or to do three of them or two of them, you know, we don't know. You know, it just depends on what the contractor proposes.

MR. MOORE: Well, I guess, now that I'm starting to--

MS. JOHNS: Every contractor goes through this same thing, I believe, you know, because--

MR. MOORE: But does a contractor have a right to ask the agency that's putting the proposal out to know what sum of funds have been allocated for a particular project area or is that not--

MS. JOHNS: I have never seen it done.

MR. MOORE: That's not disclosed. Okay. Thank you.

MR. GOLDBERG (McFARLAND): There is public information as to how much Congress appropriated for faith-based programming in the Federal Bureau of Prisons for the fiscal year '06. And that's three million dollars.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

MR. GOLDBERG (McFARLAND): So if you do up to six units, they have three million to work with.

MR. MOORE: That's more information than I got out of the panel. I appreciate that. Thank you. And that's pretty significant information actually. So thank you very much.

MR. DOLPHUS: Is that per year or for what period of time?

MS. BECK: That was just faith-based programs in general for the BOP or was that for--

MR. McFARLAND: No. That is, correct me if I'm wrong, I'm sure Susan knows, that was--the appropriation language was three million dollars for faith-based programming in--is it residential faith-based programming?

MS. VANBAALEN: I'd have to look to see if it was residential. But I'm quite sure, yeah, that it's just residential.

MR. McFARLAND: It's not for all chaplaincies, certainly, and so forth.

MS. VANBAALEN: No. It's not for chaplaincy.

MR. McFARLAND: It's intended for this pilot. And it's just fiscal '06 through September 30. Who knows what Congress will do in '07 and '08?

MR. TIMMERMAN: The way the six different facilities are listed, are they listed according to priority or they're just--well, how will--which ones are selected? How will that process take place?

MS. BECK: It will just be determined once we evaluate proposals and determine the needs at each institution. I don't know how you guys plan on picking--

MR. MORTON: We have evaluation criteria.

[Discussion off the record.]

MS. VANBAALEN: You can, you don't have to bid openly. You can bid on a specific one if you wish to do so. For example, I would like to--I'm going to use, Jack's mentioned Seagoville many times. It sounds like he might be interested in contracting at Seagoville. So he can say that he would like to have the contract at Seagoville. And that tells him certain things. He knows the location and he may know the population in general in that area, I mean, the community population and so on. So it isn't necessary for you to just bid without naming the location. And you can bid on one or all six, depending on your interest. But each one is separate, right.

MR. DOLPHUS: Did I hear you correctly you said you can bid without naming the location?

MS. VANBAALEN: No. I'm saying that you would bid for specific locations.

MR. DOLPHUS: Okay.

MS. VANBAALEN: But if you wanted to, you could bid for all six if you wanted to do so. But then you would submit the same, you know, six, six times or three times or however many you wanted to.

MR. MORTON: Whatever portion it is--

MS. JOHNS: Each institution will be a separate contract.

MS. VANBAALEN: And then how many will be able to be awarded will depend on the cost.

MR. COWLEY: Was the decision made to postpone to the 16th? I mean, you made that decision?

MS. JOHNS: Yes. In terms of the proposal, we will be issuing an amendment. You can look for that in the next day or two because that won't take any time at all to do.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): But is it possible to postpone it even further? You're saying that's, you know you will do, but let's say till June 1st?

MS. JOHNS: Well, we would have to discuss that to see how much leeway we can be given.

MR. DOLPHUS: And I notice at the beginning we didn't introduce ourselves. Is it possible that you all would allow us to introduce ourselves so we will all know who is here in terms of for partnership or collaboration.

MS. JOHNS: Certainly. Do we want to start over here on this side of the room?

MS. MASABEDER: I'm Elaine Masebeder [ph.] representing a company that does this on a non faith based--representing Center Point, a California and Oklahoma based company that does re-entry programs in a non-faith basis that is interested, I believe, in subcontracting with faith-based.

MR. PENDLETON: I'm John Pendleton. [Dismas Charities]

MS. MILLER: I'm Tracy Miller with the Kintock Group that operates in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and is also a non faith-based community organization.

MR. BALFE: Bill Balfe with the Altamount Program, representing New York State.

MR. COX: Normal Cox with the Interchange Freedom Initiative and Prison Fellowship.

MR. COWLEY: Jack Cowley with Institutional Programs, Incorporated and Alphe, USA, which is a faith-based ministry.

MR. WORTHLEY: Alvin Worthley, and I'm with the Assemblies of God Chaplaincy Ministries.

MR. TIMMERMAN: Nathan Timmerman with Chaplaincy Ministries.

MR. GOLDBERG (GOLDBERG): I'm ~~Saner Goldberg~~ (Steven Goldberg) representing JPSI for Mr. Gary Freedman is in Washington State and couldn't be here today. And I also represent a private foundation called the Adel Foundation, which is a foundation which wants to support an initiative for Jewish prisoners in particular.

MR. LONG: I'm Jim Long. I'm the spokesperson for a new council called the High Council for B'nai Noah, which is a concept of torah for non Jews. And I'm working with the rabbis here on this particular concept.

MR. STEINBERG: I'm ~~Gail~~ (Neil) Steinberg. I'm Secretary Treasurer of Jewish Prisoner Service International.

MR. MOORE: I'm Bob Moore from the Aleph Institute, a Jewish faith-based advocacy group in Miami Beach, Florida.

MR. GLUCK: I'm ~~Veron~~ (Allen) Gluck with American Community Services, Incorporated. We're based in New York, but we have a midwest region, a Florida region. We're all over the country. We are not an advocacy group for prisoners, but we would like to become involved in this initiative.

MS. WASHINGTON: I'm Frances Washington. I'm with the National Alliance of Faith and Justice, which is an affiliate of the National Association of Blacks for Criminal Justice. We're based here.

MS. MISHEK: Hi. I'm ~~Venice Mishel~~ (Theorious Hickman), I'm Vice President of the National Alliance of Faith and Justice.

MR. DOLPHUS: I'm Reverend Warren Dolphus, I'm President and CEO of the National Alliance of Faith and Justice here in Washington. We are a training and technical assistance organization.

MS. JOLLY: Reverend Juanita Jolly, Chaplain, National Alliance Faith and Justice.

MS. JOHNS: Is there anything further? Well, I want to thank you all for coming today and sharing with us. And we will look into the things that we have told you that we would take under advisement and look into. And just as soon as we have the transcript back, we will get that posted up, and hopefully some of the other answers if we come up with them in that short time period. Thank you very much. And also, if you guys didn't sign in up front, just make sure you sign in. I know some people came in a little late.

[Whereupon, at 12:22 p.m., the conference was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The BOP would like to clarify that this is not a grant opportunity. This requirement shall result in a formal contract whereby the contractor performs the requirements of the Statement of Work for the Bureau of Prisons. Evaluation of proposals will be in accordance with the evaluation criteria located in Section A.15 (FAR 52.212-2, Evaluation-Commercial Items, OCT 2000) of the solicitation. In order for proposal(s) to be considered for award, proposal(s) must meet the requirements of the solicitation and represent the best value to the government.

On **page 7**, Mr. Cox, Prison Fellowship, requested statistics regarding where the majority of inmate releases go.

RESPONSE: The Office of Research reports that the majority of inmates released are to the major urban population areas of the country to include Southern California; the Northeast Corridor (Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C.); the North Central population centers (Chicago, Indianapolis, St. Louis, and Detroit); the South Central population centers (Houston, Dallas/Fort Worth, and San Antonio); and the population centers of Atlanta, Georgia, and Florida in the Southeast Region.

On **page 9**, Mr Moore, Aleph Institute, asked if a site visit to one of the facilities could be facilitated.

RESPONSE: Due to time constraints and the logistics of arranging a site visit prior to proposal due date, a site visit is not feasible.

On **page 20**, Mr. Cox questions the size of the units (50 inmate, 75 inmates, etc.)

RESPONSE: The Bureau has put out a request to the proposed contract sites pertaining to designated living unit and program space. Once this information becomes available, it will be posted to the FedBizOpps website.

On **page 20**, Mr. Moore questions the size of group meeting rooms and where group meetings will occur.

RESPONSE: The Bureau has put out a request to the proposed contract sites pertaining to designated living unit and program space. Once this information becomes available, it will be posted to the FedBizOpps website.

On **page 29**, Mr. Gluck, Agudath Israel, asked a question of the Department of Justice representative regarding the contractor being liable for their own legal representation and whether this was constitutional.

RESPONSE: The Statement of Work does not require the contractor to indemnify the United States Government against every possible lawsuit. Rather, it only requires indemnification against claims arising out of negligent acts or omissions of the contractor, its agents, subcontractors, employees, volunteers, assignees, or any for whom the contractor may be responsible. A purely constitutional challenge that did not allege an intentional or negligent act or omission on behalf of the contractor, et al., would not appear to fall within the scope of the indemnification clause.

In the event a lawsuit against the Government and a contractor were filed challenging constitutionality of the program, the Government would represent its interests; however, the Government would not be able to represent the contractor.

On **pages 30 to 34**, Mr. Moore initiated a lengthy discussion regarding advocacy.

RESPONSE: At the present time, we are waiting for final guidance from our Office of General Counsel. Once this guidance is received, it will be posted to the FedBizOpps website.

On **pages 47 and 48**, Mr. Worthley asked about the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) having jurisdiction over Probation and Parole, and who the COTR would be after release.

RESPONSE: A Bureau COTR would not have any jurisdiction outside the Bureau. Probation and Parole would be able to contact our COTR if there were issues involving inmates who are participants of the Residential Re-Entry Program or issues between the contractor and Probation and Parole. The COTR's role would be facilitating a resolution, and/or for the Bureau to obtain information regarding performance on this phase of the contract.

On **page 51 and 52**, Mr. Moore initiated discussion and the question regarding how much money was allocated for the Residential Re-Entry Program.

RESPONSE: Mr. McFarland, Director, Task Force for Faith-Based Initiatives, is correct that the Bureau's appropriation contained \$3 million for the Life Connections Program. However, that does not reflect the Government cost estimate for this requirement, nor will the Bureau use this to determine price reasonableness of proposals.

NOTE: THROUGHOUT THE TRANSCRIPT IT WAS NOTED THAT SOME ATTENDEES' NAMES WERE MISPELLED AND/OR MISQUOTED. CORRECTIONS HAVE BEEN MADE BY STRIKING OUT THE MISPELLED/MISQUOTED NAMES WITH CORRECT NAMES NOTED IN PARANTHESIS.